BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

PURCHASED WITH THE INCOME OF THE FUND
GIVEN BY

FREDERICK MADGE
1820-1908

SON OF THE REV. THOS. MADGE, 1786-1870, OF
ESSEX STREET CHAPEL, LONDON, 1825-1859

THE

# CHRISTIAN TEACHER;

A

THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL.

VOLUME THIRD.

NEW SERIES.

LONDON:

JOHN GREEN, 121, NEWGATE STREET;

LIVERPOOL: WILLMER AND SMITH—MANCHESTER: T. FORREST.

1841.

RICHARD KINDER, PRINTER, GREEN ARBOUR COURT, OLD BAILEY.

# CONTENTS OF VOLUME III.

NEW SERIES.

## NUMBER XI.


| ART. | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | —The History of Christianity from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire | 1 |
| II. | —On the Colleges of the University of Cambridge | 16 |
| III. | —Practical Remarks on Popular Education | 25 |
| IV. | —An Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Innate Corruption of Human Nature: being an Examination of those Parts of Scripture on which it has been founded | 46 |
| V. | —Fragmentary Notices of Chinese Civilization | 67 |
| VI. | —Tracts for the People, designed to vindicate Religious and Christian Liberty | 89 |
| VII. | —On the Christian Rule of Faith | 98 |
| VIII. | —Cultivation of the Pine on the Shores of Gascony | 109 |
| IX. | —A Present from Germany; or, the Christmas-Tree | 115 |
| Intelligence :— | | |
| | Memoir of Edgar Taylor, Esq., F.S.A. | 117 |
| | The late Mrs. Barbauld—Newington-Green Chapel | 126 |
| Postscript to the Article in this Number on the Colleges of the University of Cambridge | | 128 |


## NUMBER XII.


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| I. | —Theology | 131 |
| II. | —On the Holy Plays or Mysteries of the Middle Ages | 150 |
| III. | —The Heresy of a Human Priesthood traced in Letters on the present state of the Visible Church of Christ | 161 |
| IV. | —Tracts for the People, designed to vindicate Religious and Christian Liberty | 171 |
| V. | —University Education | 178 |
| VI. | —On the Value of the Life and Writings of Paul | 195 |
| VII. | —The Question of Miracles | 226 |
| VIII. | —Father Mathew | 255 |
| IX. | —Childhood | 262 |


5746

## NUMBER XIII.


ART. PAGE

I.—Sketches of Paulus . . . . . 265
II.—Outlines of the Life of Joseph Blanco White . . . . 285
III.—The Spirit of Paul's Christianity, extracted from its Doctrinal Forms . . . . . 309
IV.—Progressive Education, or Considerations on the Course of Life 322
V.—Carpenter's Sermons . . . . . 342
VI.—Paradise after the Fall . . . . . 348
Intelligence:—
Free-Thinking Christians . . . . . 353
Newington-Green Chapel . . . . . 357
Poetry:—
Sonnet by Joseph Blanco White . . . . . 308


## NUMBER XIV.


I.—Vivia Perpetua. A Dramatic Poem. By Sarah Flower Adams 359
II.—Twelve Lectures, in Illustration and Defence of Christian Unitarianism. By J. Scott Porter . . . . . 371
III.—What am I to Believe? No. I. . . . . 392
IV.—One Tract more, or the System illustrated by "The Tracts for the Times," externally regarded. By a Layman . . 406
V.—Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, from the Poor Law Commissioners, on the Training of Pauper Children; with Appendices . . . . . 420
VI.—The Five Points of Christian Faith . . . . . 444
VII.—A Discourse on the Life and Character of the Rev. Joseph Tuckerman, D. D. Delivered at the Warren Street Chapel, on Sunday Evening, Jan. 31, 1841, by William E. Channing, D. D. . . . . 462
VIII.—Translations from the German . . . . . 479
Intelligence:—
Non-Parochial Registers . . . . . 482
Poetry:—
Sonnet . . . . . 370
Sonnet . . . . . 443
Sonnet . . . . . 478

THE

# CHRISTIAN TEACHER.

---

ART. I.—THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY FROM THE BIRTH OF CHRIST TO THE ABOLITION OF PAGANISM IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE. By the Rev. H. H. MILMAN. 3 vols. 8vo. London: John Murray.

THIS is a work that claims our highest praise, both for the learning and ability with which it is executed, and for the elevated spirit in which the Author has raised himself above the strifes and party purposes of the times. Mr. Milman writes not for his own day; nor to please any party in his own Church. He ignores the controversies, the contentions, the religious passions that are raging around him. He writes as if such things were not; as if his book was to encounter no narrow and hostile criticism: as if there was no bigotry in the world, no dogmatic theology, whose pretensions he is destroying and exposing at every page. He has evidently lifted himself into higher, purer, calmer regions; and makes his appeal not to the passing fermentations, but to the abiding reason, the enlightened philosophy of instructed man.

The work is of great compass, and we can only glance at its contents. For the first time in this country Ecclesiastical History has been made acceptable to general readers, and we confess that no work has appeared in England for many years from which we expect so much benefit indirectly to accrue to Christian Truth.

The History opens with a rapid but very able review of the state and various forms of Religion and Philosophy, both Pagan and Jewish, in the times of our Saviour. This statement of what Judaism and Heathenism had effected for mankind is the best introduction to the History of Christianity; the best proof that a new instrument was needed to place the souls of men in right relations to God; the best demonstration that the "fulness of time" was come. Judaism had lost its soul, and only

flamed up like a dying lamp in the person of John the Baptist. Paganism was any thing and was nothing; a philosophy; a fable; an allegory; a mystery; stripped of its outward form by Science; robbed of its inward spirit by Sensualism: it had no integrity, no unity in itself, and could impart none to the life of man. "The time, though fitted to receive, could not by any combination of prevalent opinions, or by any conceivable course of moral improvement, have *produced* Christianity. The conception of the human character of Jesus, and the simple principles of the new Religion, as they were in direct opposition to the predominant opinions and temper of his own countrymen, so they stood completely alone in the history of our race; and as imaginary, no less than as real, altogether transcend the powers of man's moral conception. Supposing the gospels purely fictitious, or that, like the 'Cyropædia' of Xenophon, they embody on a groundwork of fact the highest moral and religious notions to which man had attained, and show the utmost ideal perfection of the divine and human nature, they can be accounted for, according to my judgment, on none of the ordinary principles of human nature. When we behold Christ standing in the midst of the wreck of old religious institutions, and building, or rather at one word commanding to arise, the simple and harmonious structure of the new faith, which seems equally adapted for all ages—a temple to which nations in the highest degree of civilization may bring their offerings of pure hearts, virtuous dispositions, universal charity,—our natural emotion is the recognition of the Divine goodness, in the promulgation of this beneficent code of religion; and adoration of that Being in whom the Divine goodness is thus embodied and made comprehensible to the faculties of man. In the language of the Apostle, 'God is in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself.'"

Mr. Milman justly considers that a Life of Christ is indispensable to a History of Christianity. To explain the Christian movement, we must penetrate to the interior life of him who originated it. "Had the life of Christ been more generally considered as intimately and inseparably connected with the progress and development of human affairs, with the events and opinions of his time, works would not have been required to prove his existence, scarcely, perhaps, the authenticity of his history. The real historical evidence of Christianity is the absolute necessity of his life to fill up the void in the annals of mankind, to account for the effects of his religion in the subsequent history of man." And here we must say that this is just the respect in which we are least satisfied with the work of Mr.

Milman. His "Life of Christ" would not, we think "account for the effects of his religion in the subsequent history of man." He writes like an interpreter, a critic, one who has to point out the external links and connections that bind together events and speeches, one who has to show how Christianity was modified in its outward developments by the powers and philosophies of the world that beat upon it,—but nowhere does he penetrate to the living soul of this great movement,—nowhere does he show us the spiritual energy that gave birth to and that still sustains this mighty religious revolution, this development of the divine nature of man; and in vain in his cold, formal, exegetical Life of Christ should we look for the inspiration of Christianity, the deep and sufficing springs of the spiritual life of the world. We confess we do not see how, in Mr. Milman's relation of Christianity, this could be otherwise. We deprecate the petty and rude criticism which rejoices to bring into contrast the views and the position of a writer; but at the same time it is evident that Mr. Milman has neither the freedom and spontaneity of the liberal school, nor the unction, and if we may so speak, in all questions of philosophy, the unstopped facilities, the unhesitating explanations, of the orthodox school. His orthodoxy hangs loose about him. It does not colour his inmost soul. He explains nothing by it. He does not find in it his philosophy of religion. Neither has he entire sympathy with what we deem the higher view of the connections of Christ with the spirit of God, as a divine manifestation of the union that is possible between the will of man and the parent mind of our Heavenly Father. Mr. Milman holds a position between these two schools, between Rationalism and Orthodoxy; and therefore we deem him better qualified to comment upon the outward History and developments of Christianity than to reveal its sources. Mr. Milman is much more successful in tracing how the stream of Jewish opinion became tinctured by the ideas of the various climes through which its tribes were dispersed; and how the language, at least, of Christianity, if not its conceptions, holds affinities with all the religious philosophies then existing in the world. We especially recommend, with this view, to those not familiar with such knowledge, the repeated study of the second chapter of his first volume.

The expectation of a Messiah, and the nature of the Messianic anticipations, form one of the most important and mysterious questions in the history of Christianity; important as it affected the early language, determined the earliest forms, and obstructed the genuine spirit of Christianity,—mysterious, as having its sources almost undiscoverable. "Their sacred books, the Law and the Prophets, were not the clear and un-

mingled source of the Jewish opinions on this all-absorbing subject. Over this as over the whole system of the Law, tradition had thrown a veil; and it is this traditionary notion of the Messiah which it is necessary to develop: but from whence tradition had derived its apparently extraneous and independent notions, becomes a much more deep and embarrassing question. It is manifest from the Evangelic history, that although there was no settled or established creed upon the subject, yet there was a certain conventional language: particular texts of the Sacred Writings were universally recognised as bearing reference to the Messiah; and there were some few characteristic credentials of his title and office, which would have commanded universal assent." We must not trace the manner in which the East and the West, Persia, Egypt, and Greece, contributed to colour and confuse the national dream of a Messiah,—but we may state the result in the words of our Author. "Each region, each rank, each sect; the Babylonian, the Egyptian, the Palestinian, the Samaritan; the Pharisee, the lawyer, the zealot, arrayed the Messiah in those attributes which suited his own temperament. Of that which was more methodically taught in the synagogue or the adjacent school, the populace caught up whatever made the deeper impression. The enthusiasm took an active or contemplative, an ambitious or a religious, an earthly or a heavenly tone, according to the education, habits, or station of the believer; and to different men the Messiah was man or angel, or more than angel; he was king, conqueror, or moral reformer: a more victorious Joshua, a more magnificent Herod, a wider-ruling Cæsar, a wiser Moses, a holier Abraham; an angel, the angel of the Covenant, the Metatron, the Mediator between God and man; Michael, the great tutelar archangel of the nation, who appears by some to have been identified with the mysterious Being who led them forth from Egypt; he was the Word of God; an emanation from the Deity; himself partaking of the divine nature. While this was the religious belief, some there were, no doubt, of the Sadducaic party, or the half-Grecised adherents of the Herodian family, who treated the whole as a popular delusion; or as Josephus to Vespasian, would not scruple to employ it as a politic means for the advancement of their own fortunes. While the robber chieftain looked out from his hill-tower to see the blood-red banner of him whom he literally expected to come 'from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah,' and 'treading the wine-press in his wrath,' the Essene in his solitary hermitage, or monastic fraternity of husbandmen, looked to the reign of the Messiah, when the more peaceful image of the

same prophet would be accomplished, and the Prince of Peace establish his quiet and uninterrupted reign."

Christianity, though it might adopt the language of these systems, was yet in its scope and purposes entirely independent of them. It was a moral revelation; with no purpose but to establish spiritual relations between man and the Creator. It must find therefore its true explanations not in systems but in the moral nature of man; and in consistency with this its moral character, the only deviation from the course of nature, in our Author's view, was the birth of the Saviour from a pure Virgin. How much such an admission implies, we will not ungraciously inquire. Mr. Milman seems to us rather to symbolize the Virgin Mother with the softer and gentler idea of Christianity, than to state it as a theological fact, essential to the views of dogmatic divines. He even brings into friendly parallelism the martial Roman tracing his origin to the nursling of the wolf, and the gentleness and purity of Christ taking its rise in the bosom of the Virgin Mother. His whole view of this subject seems sentimental and mythical, not dogmatical or historical, and merges in the poetry and tenderness of Wordsworth:

> "Mother! whose virgin bosom was uncrost
> With the least shade or thought to sin allied;
> Woman, above all women glorified,
> O'er-tainted Nature's solitary boast;
> Purer than foam on central ocean tost,
> Brighter than Eastern skies at day-break strewn
> With forced roses, than th' unblemished moon
> Before her wane begins on heaven's blue coast,
> Thy image falls to earth. Yet sure, I ween,
> Not unforgiven, the suppliant here might bend,
> As to a visible power, in whom did blend
> All that was mixed and reconciled in thee
> Of mother's love, and maiden purity,
> Of high with low, celestial with terrene."

We cannot sufficiently express our admiration of the calm and noble fidelity to Truth in which Mr. Milman deals honestly, righteously, with whatever subject comes before him, without the thought ever crossing his mind, certainly never staining his page, as to what parties or systems of opinion the Truth might serve, or the Truth might injure. We select the following as one out of many instances:

"Even the expression, 'the remission of sins,' which to a Christian ear may bear a different sense, to the Jew would convey a much

narrower meaning. All calamity, being a mark of the divine displeasure, was an evidence of sin; every mark of divine favour therefore an evidence of divine forgiveness, The expression is frequently used in its Jewish sense in the book of Maccabees. 1 Macc. iii. 8; 2 Macc. viii. 5, 27; vii. 38. Le Clerc has made a similar observation, but is opposed by Whitby, who however does not appear to have been very profoundly acquainted with Jewish phraseology." — (Vol. i. p. 103.)

We have sometimes to regret the want of concentration, the absence of the best and closest attention of his mind, in Mr. Milman's History. This is manifested not only in carelessness and feebleness of style, but in meagre and slurred interpretations, in not taking time to gather and reveal the finer connections of a passage. The beautiful conclusion of the eleventh chapter of the Gospel of St. Matthew, where our Saviour defends the consistency and fidelity of John the Baptist, even after he had received from him a message of impatience and offence, is thus slenderly and unsatisfactorily disposed of by Mr. Milman. He would make it appear as if Christ was justifying the people for considering the Baptist as a prophet, instead of justifying the Baptist, notwithstanding his seeming defection:—

"It was no idle object which led them into the wilderness, to see as it were, 'a reed shaken by the wind,' nor to behold any rich or luxurious object—for such they would have gone to the courts of their sovereigns. Still he declares the meanest of his own disciples to have attained some moral superiority, some knowledge, probably, of the real nature of the new Religion, and the character and designs of the Messiah, which had never been possessed by John. With his usual rapidity of transition, Jesus passes at once to his moral instruction, and vividly shows, that whether severe or gentle, whether more ascetic or more popular, the teachers of a holier faith had been equally unacceptable. The general multitude of the Jews had rejected both the austerer Baptist, and himself, though of so much more benign and engaging demeanour. The whole discourse ends with the significant words, 'My yoke is easy, and my burden is light.'"

Now this, we must think, is in the coldest and most slovenly style of spiritless and slurred interpretation; and it is this that so often renders Mr. Milman's Life of Christ of no value, except for the mere information it contains, which is always considerable. To make our objection clear, we will endeavour to supply at some length, the fullness of meaning, and the finer connections in this passage, which Mr. Milman has taken no pains to collect.

We are told in the commencement of this chapter, that in *his prison* the Baptist heard of the works of Christ. The very word, prison, in connection with that child of the wilderness who lived beneath the open sky, and held converse only with Nature, suggests to us the physical irritations that must have tortured and clouded his faculties, and the morbid thoughts that must have cat into his soul. What misery greater to an impassioned reformer, whose spirit burns to do its work, than to have his hands tied, and plucked from the living world to whom his mission was, to be cast into the objectless solitudes of a dungeon! What mind could bear that heavy arrest upon its impetuous movements, that turning into contemptuous mockery of its nursed and much-loved schemes, without a bitter re-action? In this melancholy of spirit stray echoes are wafted to his dungeon of the preaching of Jesus. His heart grows darker and more perplexed as this contrast breaks upon him, of his own condition with that of Him whose way he prepared. Why should it be so? Why should *he,* one of the prime agents in the coming Reformation, thus be laid aside like a broken tool? Where were the signs of the Messiah's kingdom? Was there not unnecessary delay? Was Christ acting in the spirit of his mission? Why not take upon him, at once, his great office, and restoring the sceptre to Israel, set up at once that revival of the best days of Judaism, which was the Kingdom of God, in John's conception of it, that the Messiah was to establish? We do not believe that these brooding thoughts generated in the Baptist's mind suspicion or unbelief, for that is inconsistent with the character of the man, and with all the rest of his history; but we believe that owing to his Jewish apprehensions of what was the Christ's true Kingdom, they produced perplexity, disappointment, and impatience, and that this impatience found vent in his message to Jesus, "art thou he that should come, or must we look for another?" a message not conveying, we think, the language of unbelief, but the language of admonition and advice, a prompting of Jesus to use speed and despatch; an excited, impatient, perhaps querulous remonstrance against delay. How calm is the answer of Jesus! He asserts nothing of himself. He appeals to facts: let them speak for him. He does not declare himself to be the Messiah in answer to John's message, for with their misconceptions, he was more anxious to introduce new views of the Messiah's purpose, than to challenge attention to himself as the Christ, whilst they were yet unprepared to learn the true character which the Christ should bear. He cited his works, as vouchers for himself—they not only proved, —they did something to unfold the true scope and nature of his

mission. They were explanatory of its spirit and purpose, as well as demonstrative of its authority. They would do something to open John's mind to the true character of God's kingdom on the earth. They would unfold aims that looked farther than any resuscitation of Judaism:—"Go and show John again the things that ye do hear and see; the blind receive their sight; the lame walk; the lepers are cleansed; the deaf hear; the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them;"—and the answer is closed with that pointed admonition addressed rather to the feelings in John's mind that suggested his message than to any thing that the message itself contained, an admonition not of direct reproof, but sufficient to awaken John to new patience, thought, and faith, "and blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me."

When the messengers departed, Jesus turned to the multitude, and addressed them upon John's character, deeming it, perhaps, necessary to vindicate his consistency. John was not inconsistent but impatient, and his impatience arose out of his Jewish views of the kingdom of God, which, supposing to be in a great measure temporal and outward, he thought might be hurried on and precipitated. These two characteristics of John, Jesus brings into notice, his firmness and his unenlightened impetuosity. He appeals to the people for their sense of John's character. He was no undecided man, infirm of purpose, and wavering in his testimony that preached in the wilderness,—shaken like its own reeds, and yielding to every influence like the tall grass of the desert that bends and shivers in the blast. He who abode in the wilderness, because it was a type of himself, was not likely to go back from his faith. He was no courtier clothed in fine raiment, soft and silken, neither in mind nor body, to be open to seductive influences, or liable to caprice. The passed word of that lofty and rugged spirit would be, like the past itself, irrevocable. Such a man would be more liable to be obstinate and impetuous in an error than apt to change. The sterner class of minds are always the most uniform, and the reason is that they are not open to a wide range of influences. Sternness of temper accompanies contracted sympathies; it is connected with narrowness of thought, and John was narrow. He was thus by nature likely to be inflexible in his once delivered testimony that Jesus was the Christ; but narrow in his conceptions of the objects and purpose of the Christ, and therefore impatient and impetuous under his disappointed expectations. The source of this impatience Jesus plainly declares was in John's ignorance of the true aims of the Messiah's mission. He deemed that the kingdom of heaven might be gotten by violence,—that the violent

might take it by force,—that the Christ might long since have taken unto him his great power and reigned. He did not know that the kingdom of heaven suffereth no violence, and cometh not by observation, for the kingdom of heaven is within the soul. Though the last and greatest of Jewish prophets, yet in the scope and vision of his spirit he was only a Jew; and in the knowledge of God and of Providence, the very least in the true kingdom of heaven would be more enlightened than he. This is John's mind laid open: and thus did Christ generously defend his consistency while he traced his querulous message to its source.

That John was offended in him, suggested to Jesus' mind the melancholy recollections of past failures, and that the Jews were offended both in John and in him. They rejected alike the austerities of the one, and the human sympathies of the other. The one was insane and a fanatic: the other was too like themselves to be the great prophet of God. "But Wisdom is justified of all her children." John had his mission; and Christ had his. The world did not understand them; but they have conquered and changed the world. Each in his place was the instrument that Providence required. God fits the workman to the work; and the result has proved that his wisdom is justified.

We cannot read the record of sorrowful and depressing remembrances which this train of thought summoned before Jesus without a keen feeling of the painful trials and disappointments of that tender and sympathetic mind. There flitted before his quick thought the scenes where he had spent his strength for nought,—the cities on whose homes and people his spirit had shed its best energies and love,—and shed them only to be like water spilt on the ground, and that cannot be gathered. Devoted to them, life and mind, there comes back to him no return but this recurring experience, that they were offended in him. "Then began he to sorrow over the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not." Nazareth, Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum, are all before him, pressing their bitter memories on his fainting heart; all sought and lost; toiled for but not won; sought by works that might have averted heathen Tyre and Sidon from their desperate courses; and ministered unto by one, who if he had preached unto Sodom might have awakened even it to repentance, and stayed the fiery indignation of Heaven. But mark how Jesus calms and reassures this depression of a moment. "I thank thee, Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, that though Thou hast hid these things from the worldly wise and prudent, Thou

hast revealed them unto babes. Even so be it, Father, since so it seemeth good in Thy sight." That retreat of the spirit to its God turns the whole currents of the Saviour's mind. They are no longer "sicklied over by pale" experience, but strong in the Lord, and in the power of His grace. He is again the Saviour, with overtures of peace from Heaven; the sent in love; the seeker of the lost. Depression might cross him, but he knew his Father in Heaven too well not to bear his heart out of these shadows, and place it beneath the brightness that ever beameth from Him. It was enough. To think of God was again to be revived, again to be His Christ, strong in hope. "The Son knoweth the Father." Once more goes forth the thrilling appeal of undesponding love; "Come unto me ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. My yoke is easy, and my burden is light."

Of Mr. Milman's tendency to a rationalistic interpretation, we give the following indication:

"Now the dreadful earthquake which followed, seemed to pass away without appalling the enemies of Jesus. The rending of the veil of the Temple from the top to the bottom, so strikingly significant of the approaching abolition of the local worship, would either be concealed by the priesthood, or attributed as a natural effect to the convulsion of the earth. The same convulsion would displace the stones which covered the ancient tombs, and lay open many of the innumerable rock-hewn sepulchres which perforated the hills on every side of the city, and expose the dead to public view. To the awe-struck and depressed minds of the followers of Jesus, no doubt, were confined those visionary appearances of the spirits of their deceased brethren, which are obscurely intimated in the rapid narratives of the Evangelists."

The design with which Mr. Milman pursues the History after the death of Jesus, we must exhibit in his own words,—and in addition we can do little more than assure our readers that they will find him a most impartial and instructive guide:

"As a universal Religion, aspiring to the complete moral conquest of the world, Christianity had to encounter three antagonists, Judaism, Paganism, and Orientalism. It is our design successively to exhibit the conflict with these opposing forces, its final triumph not without detriment to its own native purity, and its divine simplicity from the interworking of the yet unsubdued elements of the former systems into the Christian mind; until each, at successive periods, and at different parts of the world, formed a modification of Christianity equally removed from its unmingled and unsullied original: the Judeo-Christianity of Palestine, of which the Ebionites appear to have been the last representatives; the Platonic Christianity of Alexandria, as, at least at this

early period, the new religion could coalesce only with the sublimer and more philosophical principles of Paganism; and, lastly, the Gnostic Christianity of the East."

There is often great ingenuity, combined with a most lively realization of the fleeting opinions and phases of a period, in the skill with which Mr. Milman discovers the causes of mysterious impressions and events in the characters and habits of thinking among those concerned. To account for the imputation to the Christians of the burning of Rome, under Nero, with the dreadful hatred and persecution of the Christians it excited, there is the following clever, if fanciful, suggestion:

"We have sometimes thought it possible that incautious or misinterpreted expressions of the Christians themselves might have attracted the blind resentment of the people. The minds of the Christians were constantly occupied with the terrific images of the final coming of the Lord to judgment in fire; the conflagration of the world was the expected consummation, which they devoutly supposed to be instantly at hand. When therefore they saw the great metropolis of the world, the city of pride, of sensuality, of idolatry, of bloodshed, blazing like a fiery furnace before their eyes—the Babylon of the West wrapped in one vast sheet of destroying flame,—the more fanatical—the *Jewish* part of the community—may have looked on with something of fierce hope and eager anticipation; expressions almost triumphant may have burst from unguarded lips. They may have attributed the ruin to the righteous vengeance of the Lord; it may have seemed the opening of that kingdom which was to commence with the discomfiture, the desolation of heathenism, and to conclude with the establishment of the millennial kingdom of Christ. Some of these, in the first instance, apprehended and examined, may have made acknowledgments before a passionate and astonished tribunal, which would lead to the conclusion that, in the hour of general destruction, they had some trust, some security, denied to the rest of mankind; and this exemption from common misery, if it would not mark them out in some dark manner, as the authors of the conflagration, at all events would convict them of that hatred of the human race so often advanced against the Jews."—(Vol. ii. p. 37.)

Ecclesiastical History is generally considered a dark record of crime, and passion, and blood. The influences of religion on individual feelings are matters of which history takes no note. It is the daring crime, the outrageous extravagance, the startling heresy, that summons the attention of the world. The kingdom of God, at all times cometh not with observation,—for the kingdom of God is *within* us. "The most divine fruits of Christianity," says Tholock, "like those of the private Christian, blossom in secret. As Nature is noisy only when she

rends asunder, but is silent when she brings forth; so it is the abuse of divine power which is more narrated in history; while none know its blessed influences, except only the sufferer who is refreshed, and the angel who numbers his dried tears. And who is there that has ever sat by, as a curious spectator, at that exhibition which of all others is the greatest in the kingdom of God, when the heart falls into rebellion against itself, and flaming desire, and smouldering rancour, amid infinite contests, are extinguished by the tears of a humility which lies low before God!" Whenever, therefore, "a glimpse is afforded of lowlier and of more common life, it is perhaps best fulfilling its office of presenting a lively picture of the times, if it allows itself occasionally some more minute detail, and illustrates the manner in which the leading events of particular periods affected individuals not in the highest station."

"Of all the histories of martyrdom, none is so unexaggerated in its tone and language, so entirely unencumbered with miracle; none abounds in such exquisite touches of nature, or on the whole, from its minuteness and circumstantiality, breathes such an air of truth and reality, as that of Perpetua and Felicitas, two African females. Their death is ascribed to the year of the accession of Geta (A. D. 202), the son of Severus. Though there was no general persecution at that period, yet, as the Christians held their lives at all times liable to the outburst of popular resentment or the caprice of an arbitrary proconsul, there is much probability that a time of general rejoicing might be that in which the Christians, who were always accused of a disloyal reluctance to mingle in the popular festivities, and who kept aloof from the public sacrifices on such anniversaries, would be most exposed to persecution. The youthful Catechumens, Revocatus and Felicitas, Saturninus and Secundulus were apprehended, and with them Vivia Perpetua, a woman of good family, liberal education, and honourably married. Perpetua was about twenty-two years old; her father and mother were living; she had two brothers—one of them, like herself, a Catechumen—and an infant at her breast. The history of the martyrdom is related by Perpetua herself, and is said to have been written by her own hand:—'When we were in the hands of the persecutors, my father, in his tender affection, persevered in his endeavours to pervert me from the faith. "My father, this vessel, be it a pitcher or any thing else, can we call it by any other name?" "Certainly not," he replied. "Nor can I call myself by any name but that of Christian." My father looked as if he could have plucked my eyes out; but he only harassed me and departed. Then after being a few days without seeing my father, I was enabled to give thanks to God, and his absence was tempered to my spirit. After a few days we were baptized, and the waters of baptism seemed to give power of endurance to my body. Again a few days, and we were cast into prison. I was terrified; for I had never before seen such total darkness. O miserable day!—from the dreadful heat of the prisoners crowded together, and the

insults of the soldiers. But I was wrung with solicitude for my infant. Two of our deacons, however, by the payment of money, obtained our removal for some hours in the day to a more open part of the prison. Each of the captives then pursued his usual occupation; but I sat, and suckled my infant, who was wasting away with hunger. In my anxiety, I addressed and consoled my mother, and commended my child to my brother; and I began to pine away at seeing them pine away on my account. And for many days I suffered this anxiety, and accustomed my child to remain in the prison with me; and I immediately recovered my strength, and was relieved from my toil and trouble for my infant, and the prison became to me like a palace; and I was happier there than I should have been any where else.

" 'My brother then said to me, "Perpetua, you are exalted to such dignity, that you may pray for a vision, and it shall be shown to you whether our doom is martyrdom or release." ' This is the language of Montanism; but the vision is exactly that which might haunt the slumbers of the Christian in a high state of religious enthusiasm; it showed merely the familiar images of the faith, arranging themselves in form. She saw a lofty ladder of gold, ascending to heaven; around it were swords, lances, hooks; and a great dragon lay at its foot, to seize those who would ascend. Saturus, a distinguished Christian, went up first; beckoned her to follow; and controlled the dragon by the name of Jesus Christ. She ascended and found herself in a spacious garden, in which sate a man with white hair, in the garb of a shepherd, milking his sheep, with many myriads around him. He welcomed her, and gave her a morsel of cheese; and 'I received it with folded hands, and ate it, and all the saints around exclaimed, "amen." I awoke at the sound, with the sweet taste in my mouth, and I related it to my brother: and we knew that our martyrdom was at hand, and we began to have no hope in this world.'

" 'After a few days there was a rumour that we were to be heard. And my father came from the city, wasted away with anxiety to pervert me; and he said, "Have compassion, O my daughter! on my grey hairs; have compassion on thy father, if he is worthy of the name of father. If I have thus brought thee up to the flower of thine age; if I have preferred thee to all thy brothers; do not expose me to this disgrace. Look on thy brother; look on thy mother and thy aunt; look on thy child who cannot live without thee. Do not destroy us all." Thus spake my father, kissing my hands in his fondness, and throwing himself at my feet; and in his tears, he called me not his daughter, but his mistress (domina). And I was grieved for the grey hairs of my father, because he alone, of all our family, did not rejoice in my martyrdom: and I consoled him, saying, "In this trial, what God wills, will take place. Know that we are not in our own power, but in that of God!" And he went away sorrowing.

" 'Another day, while we were at dinner, we were suddenly seized and carried off to trial; and we came to the town. The report spread rapidly, and an immense multitude was assembled. We were placed at the bar; the rest were interrogated, and made their confession. And it

came to my turn; and my father instantly appeared with my child, and he drew me down the step, and said in a beseeching tone, "Have compassion on your infant,"—and Hilarianus, the procurator, who exercised the power of life and death for the proconsul Trinianus, who had died, said, "Spare the grey hairs of your parent; spare your infant; offer sacrifice for the welfare of the Emperor." And I answered, "I will not sacrifice." "Art thou a Christian?" said Hilarianus; I answered; "I am a Christian." And while my father stood there to persuade me, Hilarianus ordered him to be thrust down and beaten with rods. And the misfortune of my father grieved me; and I was as much grieved for his old age as if I had been scourged myself. He then passed sentence on us all, and condemned us to the wild beasts; and we went back in cheerfulness to the prison. And because I was accustomed to suckle my infant, and to keep it with me in the prison, I sent Pomponius the deacon to seek it from my father. But my father would not send it; but, by the will of God, the child no longer desired the breast, and I suffered no uneasiness; lest at such a time I should be afflicted by the sufferings of my child, or by pains in my breast.'

"The narrative then proceeds to another instance of the triumph of faith over the strongest of human feelings, the love of a young mother for her offspring. Felicitas was in the eighth month of her pregnancy. She feared, and her friends shared in her apprehension, that on that account, her martyrdom might be delayed. They prayed together, and her travail came on. In her agony at that most painful period of delivery, she gave way to her sufferings. 'How then,' said one of the servants of the prison, 'if you cannot endure these pains, will you endure exposure to the wild beasts?' She replied, 'I bear now my own sufferings; then, there will be one within me who will bear my sufferings for me, because I shall suffer for his sake.' She brought forth a girl, of whom a Christian sister took the charge.

"Perpetua maintained her calmness to the end. While they were treated with severity by a tribune, who feared lest they should be delivered from the prison by enchantment, Perpetua remonstrated with a kind of mournful pleasantry, and said that, if ill-used, they would do no credit to the birth-day of Cæsar: the victims ought to be fattened for the sacrifice. But their language and demeanour was not always so calm and gentle; the words of some became those of defiance—almost of insult; and this is related with as much admiration as the more tranquil sublimity of the former incidents. To the people who gazed on them, in their importunate curiosity, at their agape, they said, 'Is not to-morrow's spectacle enough to satiate your hate? To-day you look on us with friendly faces, to-morrow you will be our deadly enemies. Mark well our countenances, that you may know them again on the day of judgment!' And to Hilarianus, on his tribunal, they said, 'Thou judgest us, but God will judge thee.' At this language the exasperated people demanded that they should be scourged. When taken out to execution, they declined, and were permitted to decline, the profane dress in which they were to be clad; the men, that of the priests of Saturn; the women, that of the priestesses of Ceres. They came for-

ward in their simple attire, Perpetua singing psalms. The men were exposed to leopards and bears; the women were hung up naked in nets, to be gored by a furious cow. But even the excited populace shrunk with horror at the spectacle of two young and delicate women, one recently recovered from childbirth, in this state. They were recalled by acclamation, and in mercy brought forward again, clad in loose robes. Perpetua was tossed, her garment was rent; but more conscious of her wounded modesty than of pain, she drew the robe over the part of her person that was exposed. She then calmly clasped up her hair, because it did not become a martyr to suffer with dishevelled locks, the signs of sorrow. She then raised up her fainting and mortally wounded Felicitas, and the cruelty of the populace being for a time appeased, they were permitted to retire. Perpetua seemed wrapt in ecstacy, and as if awaking from sleep, inquired when she was to be exposed to the beast. She could scarcely be made to believe what had taken place; her last words tenderly admonished her brother to be stedfast in the faith. We may close the scene by intimating, that all were speedily released from their sufferings, and entered into their glory. Perpetua guided with her own hand the merciful sword of the gladiator which relieved her from her agony."—(Vol. ii. p. 225.)

We once thought it might be interesting if we selected from these volumes the most important of Mr. Milman's concessions to a liberal and rational Theology. But we abstain from what might appear an ungracious and illiberal work,—and which, if pursued in reference to all writers, trammelled by their external position, would only have the effect of keeping them within their narrowest lines, and of repressing at once the free workings and expression of their thoughts. Once more we recommend our readers to accompany Mr. Milman over the first three centuries of the developments of Christianity,—the history of its conflicts with Judaism, Paganism, Orientalism,—of its final triumph, but not without wounds, and disfigurations, that remain to this day,—of its conquest over rudeness and polytheism, not always without sinking down both in spirit and external form to some assimilation with these its foes,—of its influences on Civilization, on Literature, on Art, on the softer, purer, and more catholic virtues of Humanity. All excuse for ignorance of the History of our Religion is now, for the first time in Britain, removed from the most indolent, or the most fastidious.

## Art. II.—ON THE COLLEGES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

The clergy of the Church of England form, at the present day, a large and powerful corporation, in which the external appearance of uniformity is attempted to be preserved both before and after ordination.

When testimonials for orders are presented to the bishop of the diocese in which the curacy conferring the title to ordination is situated, the three clergymen who sign the testimonials are required to testify, that as far as they know or believe, the candidate, whom they recommend, has not at any time, held, written, or taught anything contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the United Church of England and Ireland.

At the same time, testimonials are required from the college in which the candidate has been educated, and few candidates are allowed to be ordained at the present day, by any bishop, unless they have actually taken the degree of Bachelor of Arts, in the university to which they belong: this degree is in fact, at Cambridge, merely a proof of the possession of a certain amount of literary and scientific knowledge, but by the ingenuity of the interested parties, an ecclesiastical test has been imposed as a part of the ceremony of graduation, and the candidates for the degree of Bachelors of Arts are required to subscribe themselves "*bonâ fide*" members of the Church of England, as by law established, before they are allowed to take this secular degree.

Previous to ordination, the candidate for orders is further required to sign the following declaration in the presence of the bishop:—

"I, A. B., do willingly, and from my heart, subscribe to the thirty-nine articles of religion of the United Church of England and Ireland, and to the three articles in the thirty-sixth canon; and to all things therein contained."

From a comparison of these two tests for the degree of Bachelor of Arts at Cambridge, and for the more important distinction of ordination, it is manifest that to the divinity student, who intends to subscribe all the thirty-nine articles, and the three articles of the thirty-sixth canon of the Church of England, the declaration of membership with the Church of England must be a mere form, and that there cannot be much practical use in the continuance of such a form for the degree,

as a test of the doctrinal opinions of the clergy of the Church of England.

Political power is probably the main cause of the maintenance of any religious tests for literary and scientific honors at Oxford and Cambridge.

The two ancient universities of England are close boroughs under the management of a large majority of influential clergymen belonging to the Church of England, and these two educational corporations are considered as bulwarks of the church, and citadels of the church, and they seem to be supposed to be mainly supported by the divinity students, who are afterwards to be ordained as clergymen of the Church.

But whatever may be the case on this subject with respect to the smaller colleges of the University of Cambridge, proofs are quite accessible, to show that the divinity students only constitute a minority of the total number of students in the largest college of that university.

Registers are preserved, from which a very near approximation to the precise numbers required may be deduced, and the numerical superiority of the lay students over the divinity students in Trinity College, Cambridge, is thus proved.

| Years. | Number of admissions of Students. | Number of College Testimonials for Orders. |
|---|---|---|
| 1831 | 159 | 41 |
| 1832 | 149 | 52 |
| 1833 | 144 | 67 |
| 1834 | 156 | 30 |
| 1835 | 144 | 38 |
| 1836 | 165 | 47 |
| 1837 | 123 | 38 |
| 1838 | 154 | 37 |
| 1839 | 124 | 40 |
| 1840 | 121 | 43 |
| | 1439 | 433 |
| Deduct for Absentees | 50 | |
| Add for extra testimonials | | 40 |
| | 1389 | 473 |

Two corrections have been introduced into the foregoing table, first a deduction of five names per annum, from the list of admissions, as a loss of about five names is said to be generally found between the number of admissions, and the number of students admitted, who actually come up to reside at Cam-

bridge; and secondly, an addition of about four names per annum is required for a small number of testimonials for orders varying from three to five, which are granted at the time of graduation, and are not included in the general list, which is formed from the testimonials granted at other times.

A few ten year men, amounting to four altogether, might be added to the list of admissions, but as these students are already in orders, and merely come up to qualify themselves for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, they are usually out of the ordinary line of college instruction, and their number is so exceedingly small in Trinity College, that they have hardly any influence in the support of the college.

The average proportion of the admissions to the testimonials for each year, from 1831 to 1840, will consequently be as 138 to 47 nearly, or, in other words, the proportion of the total number of students to the number of divinity students is as three to one nearly, on an average of ten years. Many of the students who are admitted as members of Trinity College, do not remain to take any degree in the university: some leave the university during the first year of residence, or at the conclusion of their first years: others remain two years, others three, and a considerable number are always found to remain during the whole period of three years and a quarter, to qualify themselves for the degree of a Bachelor of Arts.

An interval of about three years and a half is required from all students who are untitled commoners, between the degree of Bachelor of Arts and the higher degree of Master of Arts: a second visit to Cambridge is also requisite in order to take the degree of Master of Arts, and various fees are expected at that period, as well as a subscription to the three articles of the thirty-sixth canon of the Church of England.

When the degree of Master of Arts is once taken, the graduate thereby becomes a member of the senate of the University of Cambridge, and it is remarkable, that the proportion of the laity to the clergy among the members of the senate, who are registered as members of Trinity College, is far greater than the same proportion among the total number of the members of the senate in the whole university, where the clergy predominate, by a large majority, over the laity.

Trinity College consists partly of members on the foundation, and partly of independent members, who are not in the receipt of money from the endowments of the college: both classes of members have an equal right to vote in the senate house of the university, and the proportion of the laymen to the clergymen among the registered electors is very nearly equal, with a slight

preponderance of about two in favour of the clergymen, from a total number of more than 900 voters.

On the occasion of the recent contested election for the honorary office of the high steward of the University of Cambridge, the total number of voters, belonging to Trinity College, who gave their votes in Cambridge, was 469, and of these, a large proportion were certainly laymen, but in the aggregate of 1461 votes, which were given by the members of the different colleges in the university, including Trinity College, it is said that 900 or 1000 were the votes of clergymen, and it is highly probable that Lord Lyndhurst would have obtained a majority from the votes of clergymen entirely independent of the support of any laymen.

There can be no doubt at all, but that the clergy of the church of England do actually hold a predominant political power in both the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and as both these universities are represented in parliament, it becomes a legitimate subject of public interest to inquire into the origin of their parliamentary influence.

Royal charters were granted to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, in the first year of the reign of King James the First, (A. D. 1603,) for the election of Members of Parliament, of which two were allowed to each university.

Soon after these privileges had been conferred, fears were entertained lest the universities might thus lose a portion of the aristocratic patronage, which they had before enjoyed, as the duty of watching over their interests, and of protecting their rights and exclusive privileges was specially confided to their own representatives in parliament.

At the present time it is certain, that as popular power increases, and as the universities become gradually secularized, their peculiar position and their advantages will form the subject of frequent debate, and even of legislation in parliament, and the representation of their supposed interests will naturally be considered as a political advantage, while the actual possession of a majority of votes by the clergy of the Church of England will ensure, for a long time, a decidedly ecclesiastical bias to all the political proceedings of the governing body in each university.

Among the resident members of the University of Cambridge, nearly all the graduates, who are members of the senate, are also clergymen, and fellows of colleges. Indeed, the peculiarity of college statutes generally requires the taking of orders, under the penalty of expulsion from the college, which is interpreted

to mean a retirement from the foundation or endowed portion of the college.

Such an extraordinary statute was probably at first intended to induce talented and highly educated men to enter the clerical profession in the Church of England, in order to obtain the advantage of a fellowship, or to retain that emolument when once acquired. Laymen, however, contrive to obtain admittance among the college fellows in Trinity College, by an ingenious interpretation of the laws, which is worthy of notice.

Those persons only are to be chosen as the fellows of Trinity College, according to the statutes, who propose to themselves, as their final object, the study of sacred scripture, and within seven years after their admission to the degree of Masters of Arts, they are to take priests' orders, or to be for ever excluded from the college, and they are to take the following oath, among others:

"I, N. N., swear and take God to witness, that I will make Theology the end of my studies; and that when the time prescribed in these statutes shall arrive, I will either take Holy Orders, or quit the College."

These two clauses are interpreted as if they only formed one clause, and as if the alternative of quitting the college included the study of Theology, as well as the taking of Holy Orders.

Owing to this interpretation, or to indifference about the oath, there are usually about an equal number of laymen and clergymen to be found among the junior fellows of the college, though the senior fellows, who are all of long standing in the university, are necessarily clergymen of the Church of England, and the principal college tutors are generally of the same clerical profession.

It may, however, be seriously questioned, whether Trinity College, Cambridge, be, at the present day, a college of divines, when the majority of the students appear to go into lay professions, and when laymen actually hold a considerable number of the college fellowships.

At the commencement of the seventeenth century, Trinity College, and many other colleges at Cambridge, were, probably, colleges of divines, but it is their interest, at the present day, to become secularized, and the addition of talented lawyers to the body of the clergy is by no means a slight advantage, nor one which is undervalued by the clergy themselves.

A general account of the state of the university in 1603 is contained in the preamble to the charter of King James the First to the university, for the election of two representatives in parliament, and all the colleges certainly appear, from this

document, to have been an especial object of the royal interest, and were obviously intended to be represented in parliament, with respect to their individual interests, as well as the more general interests of the university.

The charter commences in the following words :

"James, by the grace of God, king of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c., to all whom the present letter may reach, greeting.

"Whereas our academy and University of Cambridge, in our county of Cambridge, is an ancient University, consisting of sixteen colleges, halls, and hostels of good learning, founded partly by our most illustrious and mighty ancestors, the kings and queens of this kingdom, and partly by archbishops, lords, grandees, nobles, bishops, and other distinguished, pious, and devout men; and moreover endowed and augmented with noble and ample rents, revenues, possessions, privileges, and other property, to the honor of God, and to the support and promotion of piety, virtue, erudition and learning. In which colleges, halls, and hostels, many local statutes, constitutions, ordinances, laws, and enactments have been made, published and ordained, both for the good administration and government of the said colleges, halls, and hostels, and of their members, and of the students in the same, and of other persons residing there; and for the lease, discharge, disposition, and preservation of the rents, revenues, possessions, and other property given, granted, assigned, or confirmed to the aforesaid colleges, halls, or hostels by their founders, or otherwise. For the observance and maintenance of which statutes, constitutions, ordinances, laws, enactments, and privileges, all those persons, or the majority of them, take corporal oaths upon the sacred gospels of God.

"And whereas in times past, and especially lately, many statutes and acts of Parliament have been made and proclaimed, both for and concerning the lease, discharge, disposition, and preservation of the rents, revenues, and possessions of the said colleges, halls, and hostels, and of their members, who are students, and residents therein :—It seems, therefore, to be worth while and necessary, that the said University, (which abounds in a multitude of men endowed with piety, wisdom, learning, and integrity,) and in which all branches of science, both divine and human, and likewise all the liberal arts have been cultivated and professed, shall, for the common advantage of the whole state, as well as of the University aforesaid, and of each of the colleges, halls, and hostels aforesaid, have burgesses in Parliament, from among their own members, who shall make known to the high court of Parliament from time to time the true state of the said University, and of each college, hall, and hostel therein, so that no statute or general act may tend to the prejudice or injury of those institutions, or of any one of them in particular, through want of just and proper knowledge and information."

From this preamble to the charter, it seems that all the corporations of the colleges and of the university are legally re-

presented in parliament, under the title of the university, and that each separate college must be in some degree a public institution, entitled to its own share of power and influence in the return of the representatives of the associated body of all the colleges.

But it is not only with reference to the House of Commons that the Colleges possess political power: the two honorary offices of the Chancellor and the High Steward of the University, are now invariably bestowed on members of the House of Lords; and, in fact, the two noblemen selected for these offices are the representatives, in the House of Lords, of the interests of the majority of the senate of the university: and the Duke of Northumberland and Lord Lyndhurst would, in all probability, be expected, by their constituents, to advocate the privileges and the exclusiveness of the university and the colleges, in the case of any further change being proposed in parliament with respect to any of those ancient bodies.

From this double advantage of being specially represented in both houses of parliament, the constitution of the university itself and of its colleges becomes interesting in a public point of view, and their governing principles may thus be closely examined as in the case of all other public institutions.

The present state of the predominant ecclesiastical feeling among the college authorities in the University of Cambridge, is well expressed in the following words from an address delivered to the Cambridge Camden Society, on the 28th March 1840, by its president, the Venerable Archdeacon Thorp, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College.

> "There was a time, indeed, and it is not even yet quite gone by, when the Universities were considered worthy of no higher office or honour, than as an arena, where men were to contend in the generous conflicts of the intellect, to strive for scholarships and fellowships, to win medals and degrees."
>
> "But we trust that a sounder notion of our duties and our privileges is beginning to prevail; and that it is not considered here to be bigotry, to maintain, that though their doors are open with a liberal interpretation to all, who have on their part no conscientious grounds for refusing to conform to usages in which the Church's doctrine and discipline are recognized without compromise, still they are properly nurseries of Churchmen and for the Church."

It must not be supposed, however, from these remarks, that the students are now compelled to attend at the sacrament in Cambridge. The ancient law of compulsion on this subject still remains a disgrace to the university statute book, but mo-

dern practice permits the attendance of the students at the Eucharist to be voluntary, and this change of system is thus deservedly praised by the Rev. Professor Sedgwick, M.A., and Senior Fellow of Trinity College:—

"There are no forced Eucharists at Cambridge. At Trinity College, (and I believe I may include in the remark every College in the University,) there has not, for many years, been the semblance of a punishment for absence from the sacrament. Within my recollection of Cambridge there was a *nominal* punishment for absence, but it was never intended to have the force of a compulsive law: and among the earliest lessons the students of my own year received from the public tutor, was an exhortation to attend the Eucharist, accompanied at the same time with a solemn caution, that those who could not go with a clear conscience should keep away. Let me add, (and I speak from the experience of a thirty years' residence,) that on no occasion, either public or private, have I seen this holy rite of our Church performed with more solemnity and devotion than it is at the altar of a College Chapel. A hypocrite may sometimes have knelt down amongst us; but who can dare to look into the mazes of a man's heart?"*

Attendance at the reading of the morning or evening prayers of the Church of England is still insisted upon from all the students, with hardly any exception, at Cambridge, but their attention to the service is not required, and it is seldom given, unless on Sundays, or occasionally on week-days; but they are always careful to maintain decorum, and a mechanical uniformity during the service.

In this respect, too, ancient laws are now obsolete; for all the students of Trinity College were ordered to be severely reprimanded, according to the statutes of Elizabeth, if they took no part in the Common Prayer, or if they did not attend to the Lessons. At the present day, the repetition of responses is entirely voluntary, and must remain so, unless it should be wished to exclude dissenters from the chapel, which they are now compelled to attend.

It would indeed be most unreasonable to expect that the Unitarian members of any college in Cambridge should be obliged to repeat aloud the responses to the invocation to the Trinity, at the commencement of the Litany; and especially, as at present, dissenting students are only expected to remain quiet, and their thoughts may, consequently, be directed far away from the service, in which they cannot thoroughly and conscientiously join.

Many of the ancient laws, both of the University and of the

* Letters to the Editors of the Leeds Mercury, in reply to R. M. Beverley, Esq., pages 30 and 31; printed in 1836.

Colleges at Cambridge, were obviously intended to confer exclusive privileges on the clergy of the Established Church of this country; but as Roman Catholics, Dissenters, and Jews, are now admitted to reside in the colleges, and as laymen obtain fellowships in the society which was once the principal college of divines, the ecclesiastical spirit of exclusiveness is manifestly in some degree modified, and there is ground to hope for further concessions to the spirit of the times, and to the pecuniary interests of the university and the college corporations.

It is quite possible, for instance, that without the abolition of any test, the senate of the University of Cambridge may perhaps be induced to suspend the ecclesiastical subscription required for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, until the creation of the Master of Arts, thereby preserving to the senate of the university its ancient ecclesiastical character, while the degree of Bachelor of Arts may thus be conferred on Dissenters and Roman Catholics, as well as on members of the Church of England.

If, with this boon, the suffrage should also be extended to Bachelors of Arts, so that votes may be given for the members of Parliament, without any ecclesiastical restriction on the franchise, Dissenters and Roman Catholics should be contented to sign a moderate declaration, that they will not exercise any power, authority, or influence, by virtue of their office of Bachelors of Arts, to injure or weaken the Protestant Church, as it is by law established in England, or to disturb the said church, or the bishops and clergy of the said church, in the possession of any rights or privileges to which such church, or the said bishops and clergy, are or may be by law entitled.

Such a declaration is already required from the officers of all English corporations, in the place of the sacramental tests, by the 9th George IV. chap. 17, and uniformity and expediency appear to demand it as a substitute for the present declaration of decided membership with the Church of England, for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, in the University of Cambridge.

The predominant fears of change which influence some of the leading resident members of that university, are not connected with the security of the universities, but with the security of the Church of England, and on this account, the suspension of an ecclesiastical test would be preferred to its abolition, as the former laws of ecclesiastical exclusiveness might thus remain on the statute-book for the degree of Master of Arts, while the exercise of them would be suspended for the degree of Bachelor, and the senate of the university would still meet in its ancient form of an ecclesiastical corporation.

J. H.

## Art. III.—PRACTICAL REMARKS ON POPULAR EDUCATION. By A Schoolmaster. No. 3.

### *Things wanted.*

Towards the termination of my last paper I ventured to make the suggestion, that in teaching the young in our popular schools to know themselves, it was of consequence that we should communicate to them some first notions at least, of the qualities of the human mind, of its healthful and unhealthful states, and the conditions on which its sound action is known to depend. I consider such instruction to be of so much importance, that I wish distinctly to mark the opinion, by placing it in the prefront of my present communication. It is not, however, impossible that this opinion, and others which I have advanced, may have led some to consider me as somewhat of an educational visionary. I have certainly no wish to be so deemed. At the same time I do not profess to feel any great anxiety about the results which may ensue to myself from the temperate enunciation of my deliberate convictions. How dear soever I may regard the favourable estimate of my fellow men, truth, and frankness of speech must be held by me dearer still. Nor would I knowingly give utterance to any opinion, especially on so important a subject as that which occupies our thoughts from any other consideration than an assured conviction of its truth, and a high estimate of its value. There is already but too much affectation of educational novelty in society. I know not whether there is any thing in the subject itself which invites and favours such affectation, but every great educational reform has been attended by a larger share of pretension than falls to the lot of other social transitions. In Athens these empty and showy declaimers, the sophists, who would prove for you almost any thing from any premises, make the worse appear the better reason, and upturn the grounds and pervert the practice of morality itself, appear from the keen exposures which we have of them from the lips of Socrates and the pens of his disciples, to have availed themselves of the educational excitement of their day, to trade in large promises and extravagant pretensions, which they had scarcely the will, even if they had the ability to perform. The revival of letters throughout Europe, was another great educational crisis, which presented similar empirical displays. Public disputation became a prevailing passion. Men undertook to teach every thing by short cuts, as if by patent inventions—to adopt the words of the great satirist as well as moral painter of his day—

words which he puts into the mouth of Bianca's music-master in his "Taming of the Shrew,"

> "I must begin with rudiments of art;
> To teach you gamut *in a briefer sort,*
> *More pleasant, pithy, and effectual,*
> Than hath been taught by any of my trade."

And how splendid soever may have been the talents—how extensive soever the attainments of the Admirable Crichton, we at this time of day cannot but think there was no small degree of empiricism in a man, who, though he died at the early age of twenty-two, "professed himself before the most learned bodies of Europe ready to dispute in all the sciences, to answer any questions, and to repel any objections either by logic or a hundred kinds of verse, or by analytical investigations and mathematical figures;" and who, in addition to skill in corporeal exercises, held himself out as a proficient in music, and in no fewer than ten languages, which, says a biographer, "were as familiar to him as his mother-tongue."

Not dissimilar grandeur of profession have we at the present day. Read the cards of terms and the advertisements which are put forth. Persons who are unable to write grammatically, undertake to teach grammar,—who cannot follow out on paper a correct sequence of ideas, offer themselves as instructors in logic; persons who know scarcely more of the sciences than their names, the very pronunciation of which some are not masters of, profess to expound for the edification of the young, the mysteries of "the Globes," as it is phrased, Astronomy, Algebra, Mensuration, Book-keeping, Stenography, and as many other branches as you choose, each and all by methods no less expeditious than infallible. Surely there must be men with whom knowledge comes by intuition, and skill in teaching is an instinct; with whom the old Platonic doctrine, that we bring into the world with us ideas gained in our previous state of existence, is established by happy experience, and the obvious facts of the case; for as to the orthodox and rugged way of learning before you teach, their genius is of too transcendent a nature for such antiquated drudgery. No matter what their former calling, nor what their former failures, they are now expert at every science, and deeply read in every tongue, or, as Sly describes himself in the same drama—

> "I, Christopher Sly, old Sly's son of Burton-heath, by birth a pedlar, by education a card-maker, by transmutation a bear-herd, and now by present profession a tinker——"

they have passed through as many transmutations as Pythagoras himself could have imagined, and improving at every turn, have at last "jumped Jim Crow," the schoolmaster, and keep each a "mathematical, classical, and commercial academy," where proficient scholars in every branch are produced with the productiveness of steam, and the velocity of railroads.

It is not least among the services which that inimitable satirist, the author of "Nicholas Nickleby," has rendered to the cause of true knowledge and unsophisticated feeling, that in his unsparing anatomy of schools of the Greta Bridge class, he lays open Mr. Squeers' "new practical method" of teaching the sciences :—

"'We go upon the practical mode of teaching, Nickleby; the regular educational system. C-l-e-a-n, clean, verb active, to make bright, to scour: w-i-n, win, d-e-r, der, winder, a casement. When the boy knows this out of book, he goes and does it. It's just the same principle as the use of the globes.—Where's the second boy?'—'Please, sir, he's weeding the garden,' replied a small voice.—'To be sure,' said Squeers, by no means disconcerted; 'so he is. B-o-t, bot, t-i-n, tin, bottin, n-e-y, ney, bottiney, noun substantive, a knowledge of plants. When he has learned that bottiney is a knowledge of plants, he goes and knows 'em. That's our system, Nickleby; what do you think of it?'"

It is an indication of a return to a sounder state of things, that people begin to entertain educational novelties with suspicion; and though all such terms as visionary, quixotic, and innovation, are two-edged tools, and may be made to discountenance the good as well as the bad, yet society is in a hopeful state when it becomes sensible of the impositions which are attempted to be practised upon it, and the pioneers of its way, its satirists, cover existing fudge with merited contempt.

To persons whose minds have been chiefly engaged in noting the contrast, the humiliating contrast, which exists between what is often professed, and what is effected by even the more costly of our present educational establishments, the outline I have given of a course of popular training, may well appear impracticable; and certainly I too think it impracticable with our actual instrumentality. I therefore proceed to point out what appear to me some indispensable pre-requisites. A thorough educational reform must of necessity be slow in coming, and it can never come till certain existing influences undergo an entire change.

And *first*, the mind of the public at large must be more enlightened than it is at present. Education is for the most part

an internal work and an internal result. Its greatest achievements are not in the dexterity of the fingers, but in the sound, vigorous and well-balanced action of the mind itself—not so much in any actual acquirement of knowledge—as the possession of internal power, of a well disciplined and a well-regulated mind—in habits of steady and sustained application, in activity and precision of thought, in the ability to investigate, acquire, to turn knowledge to account: in the language of Milton on another subject, "to know and hence to do." Now these are educational results for which an uninformed, or a superficially-informed public can have little or no estimate, and little or no appreciation. They are too much internal for them to see or value. They are therefore results for which there is no effectual demand. It is that which is palpable to sense which they admire, and what they admire they naturally seek for. Display in consequence imposes upon the public mind. Large pretensions are taken at even more than their full value. I am just old enough to remember, that at the termination of the last war, eight and twenty shillings were secretly given for a guinea. The public have often done worse in regard to education; they have paid in gold more than its current price for paper-money. Hence educational speculators swarm over the land. Imposing manners are preferred to solid acquirements, and loud professions to aptness to teach. The wider the range of knowledge offered to their acceptance, and the shorter the time required for its communication, the greater the popularity, especially if to a scorn of established methods there is added a bold claim of novelty, and around the whole is thrown a veil of German mysticism. The remedy for these current evils can be found only in an improvement of the public intelligence. Education is in its nature one of those things of which the ordinary purchasers are, in actual circumstances, least able to judge. The great patrons of education are to be found in the middle classes, among our shopkeepers, merchants—persons who for the most part possess money and good feeling—the means of usefulness which industry affords, and a wish to turn their means to a good account—but who are too generally unable to appreciate the quality of the article they desire to possess themselves and to communicate to others. Can we wonder then that the supply corresponds with the demand? and how can we improve the article brought to market, except we improve the taste and enlarge the intelligence of the customers? I do not of course mean that superior minds may not influence for the better the course of school education—but I do mean that this process of improvement is tardy and not altogether seen—while

there can be no doubt that if parents and patrons become duly sensible of the kind of education that the young ought to receive, our educators will not fail to fit themselves for the duties of their office, or give way to less incompetent men. In medicine we have a case in point. What has become of the solemn air of pretension under which ignorance not very long since veiled its insufficiency? The bag-wig, the gold-headed cane, the important and mysterious air of the old-fashioned physician, has descended into that limbo of social follies into which educational quackery is, I trust, destined to hasten. What intelligence has done in one case it will not in time fail to effect in the other. But this leads me to

A *second* requisite; Medical practice owes no small part of the reformation it has undergone to the prevalence of improved modes of education, and the establishment of suitable tests of ability, in the profession itself. It has done much by its own efforts to redeem its character, to raise the practice into the dignity of a profession. And so—one of our first duties will be to educate our educators, and to adopt the necessary means for ascertaining that those who aspire to the office are competent to discharge its duties. It appears from the evidence of Dr. Kay before the Educational Committee of the House of Commons, that out of 1375 teachers engaged in the towns of Manchester, Salford, Liverpool, Bury, and York, in the education of the young of the poorer classes, only 130—130 out of 1375—one-tenth, had received any education for their employment. And of the comparatively few teachers that the normal school connected with the British School Society trains for the work of education, the average of time which they remain under instruction, we learn from Mr. Dunn's evidence before the same Committee, does not extend beyond three, or at the utmost four months. With great propriety might Mr. Dunn assert that such a period was quite insufficient. "The question," he goes on to say, "the question often is, shall we send out a man with four months' training, or shall we let them have a man with no training at all." Up to this time or nearly so, the education of our educators has been left almost exclusively to chance. It is true that a large share of the work of education —especially of the higher education, is in the hands of ministers of religion who are generally men of more or less knowledge and cultivation. But the cases are rare indeed in which any person is able to discharge adequately the duties of two professions; and the ministers of religion, how much soever they may labour to turn their knowledge to account in the work of education, have not received a training specifically for the pur-

pose, and fully am I satisfied that a specific training is requisite for the office of an educator. There is scarcely an office—not even the ministry of religion itself—which requires more peculiar aptitudes; there is scarcely an office which involves higher or more sacred obligations; and it is indeed to be regretted, that even in the least insufficient class of instructors, the business of education should have been made a mere appendage to another profession—a means to eke out the resources which a certain position in society requires. Nor am I a believer in the doctrine that a less competent set of instructors will suffice for our popular schools. I do not indeed say that they demand the same extent and variety of knowledge as is needed in the Grammar-school. Yet in this very difficult and very important work, it is not easy to mention the branch of knowledge which may not be made serviceable even in a parish school;—but the great want is of persons who have studied, carefully studied, education as a science, who have therefore made themselves well acquainted with the human mind—the material, so to say, with which they have to work—who have had what may be a natural aptitude for communicating knowledge, and training the mental and moral powers, well disciplined and developed; who have acquired that first great lesson in the art of commanding, the habit of rational obedience, and have been led to govern themselves as an essential preliminary to governing and improving others. Now if these high results, these superior accomplishments are essential requisites in a good educator, how are they to be acquired if the work of education is still left to those who have failed in other pursuits—to those who have other and most absorbing duties,—how, in short, except by the adoption of a suitable plan for educating our educators? Something may be done by indirect means. If you establish good schools here and there up and down the country, and place in them the best masters you can find, you will not fail to exert a beneficial influence in the respective neighbourhoods. But all who have made the attempt are fully aware that the great difficulty is to find teachers competent to work out the ideas they have formed, and the plans they set in action. In no one thing more than in a school does success depend on the principal who is employed in its duties. The best devised system will prove of little avail and will soon degenerate into mediocrity or worse, unless you place over it a competent head; and even a bad system in good hands shall produce better results; for in a school it is emphatically true that the government which "is best administered is best." We have then no adequate resource—we have no sure warrant for

able instructors, but in an instrumentality which shall secure a good education for our educators.

One immediate consequence of such a preparatory discipline would supply ANOTHER REQUISITE—it would tend to create a rational confidence on the part of parents and patrons. One effect of the excitement which has now for some time prevailed on the subject of education, is in the existence of a restlessness and proneness to dissatisfaction on the part of parents towards the teachers of the young. So much, and for the most part so justly, have existing modes of tuition been impeached, that parents, whether able to form a correct judgment or not, and even to some extent children themselves, have become imbued with a disposition to find fault, to doubt, distrust, and perhaps subvert the plans which in any case may be pursued. This is an unhappy state of things. I do not mean that I wish it had never existed. It is a necessary part of the transition through which we are going, from what was very bad to what I believe will prove something better; and I would far rather that the uneasiness and discontent were universal as well as intense, than that society should continue to suffer under its educational wrongs. At the same time it is an evil. It doubles the difficulties of the teacher, interferes with his plans, his discipline, his peace, and general efficiency. However enlightened he may be, however zealous in the discharge of his duties, the educator, if liable to anxious, distrustful, and perhaps unwise interference from the parent, will find in that influence his greatest impediment, and cannot fail to have no small part of his labours and hopes frustrated. Many illustrations of this remark have come within my own knowledge. I know a teacher who received charge of a boy that had been subjected to habitual flogging, in order to secure his progress in the Latin language. He was but a child, and the result, as might have been anticipated, was, a thorough dislike of the study, and an entire inaptitude for its prosecution. Acting on the judicious plan that abstinence is the best remedy for a diseased appetite, the new teacher did not allow the boy to proceed with the language, but told him that he should do so when he had made progress in other pursuits. The plan was proceeding with every promise of a good result, when the parent interfered, intimated that he "paid for a classical education, and wished his son to have it." Explanation was tendered by the instructor—but in vain. The Latin was resumed, every effort was made—but no progress. Abstinence was again ventured on—again set aside by the parent; and the final result was, that the boy acquired little more good than a slight abatement of his inveterate distaste for the

study. I know of another case in which a boy who had contracted in low company the habit of using gross and offensive language, was removed from an institution because only moral means were tried for his correction, his parent stating that he thought it better his son should go where flogging was customary, as if even his actual master would depart from his practice and inflict corporal punishment on him, he should object to its being done, for then the discredit and the pain would be too marked and severe; and so the boy was sent to a school where the cane, by being in constant requisition, lost the only value it can have, in being used very seldom and but for special delinquencies.

If, however, teachers had in general received a competent education before they entered on the duties of their office, and if some outward sign and seal were adopted by which the instructed educator should be known, the confidence of parents would be at least so far conciliated, that they would be ready to think favourably of teachers till experience had proved their incompetency: and thus the intelligent among them would not have their efforts obstructed, but enjoy full opportunity for carrying out their ideas into practice, and of proving their sufficiency for their important engagements. And such confidence would also not only increase their influence with their pupils, enabling them to realise their plans and wishes, and to dispense with severity of discipline, but also raise the profession generally in public esteem, secure it a less incompetent remuneration, and call into its walks persons of superior endowments. Next to the ministers of religion, there is no body of functionaries in whose character the public has so great an interest as in the instructors of the young. With them lies no small portion of the influence which determines the happiness of each successive age; true, they make not the laws, but theirs it is to form the character of the age which gives its bearing to legislation; they do not dispense justice, but they make our judges, and determine the complexion of our calendars; and if, of any class, emphatically of the most numerous, the most exposed to temptation, the least prosperous, and the least restrained by general refinement and prescriptive observances, emphatically of the working myriads, the educators demand our most careful attention. Once raise them, raise them to a sense of the importance and dignity of their office—to no niggard sufficiency for its duties; especially raise them to a high moral tone, to a self-respect, to genuine Christian benevolence, and you have by this one act done much to elevate and refine the tone, and enlarge the happiness of the great mass of the nation. The instructors of

the youth of the labouring population, are a body of men who associate more in our Protestant country with the adult portion of them, than any other educated class. At present these instructors are too little elevated above the people and too dependent on them, to exert a very beneficial influence; indeed it is to be feared that, as they are sometimes chosen by them for qualities which are more imposing than estimable, so do they even (inadvertently it may be,) encourage in their patrons the very habits of thought, feeling and action, which they ought gently but faithfully to resist and wear away. But if the instructors were themselves duly instructed, and especially if they were men of a high but not severe moral tone, of kind and courteous deportment, yet possessed of firmness of character, they could not fail to make their indirect influence highly advantageous to the people at large. A salutary stream of moral purity, as well as of intellectual light, would go forth from each school-establishment, and while we only aimed to educate the young, we should, in reality, be securing the improvement of the mature—an improvement which in its turn would act beneficially on the schoolmaster as well as the school, refining his own character while it increased the efficiency of his direct instructions.

This train of thought brings me to *a fourth requisite*; one of not less consequence than any I have yet noticed. There must be a change for the better in the character, feelings, and conduct, of not a few of the parents, before we can realise our wishes for the children. Whatever time may be occupied in school duties, how many hours does a child spend during which the professed instructor has no influence over him; spend under influences for which the parent only is and can be answerable! And these are the very periods when the young are most susceptible of impressions; when the moral and intellectual life opens spontaneously to surrounding influences, and receives them therefore most readily and most deeply. If in the actual state of things I am asked, who and what educates our young—I answer, their mother and their father, their brothers and sisters, their playmates, their casual companions. As it is, school is very much what the French term, "a false position," a state of unnatural and irksome restraint—a sort of intellectual prison, whence the young escape as soon as they can, and escape with that gladness and impetuosity which give a zest and an impulse to every other influence in which they may be engaged. Thus even a factitious power is given to influences which are in themselves sufficiently strong; and whatever, therefore, presents itself to their acceptance out of the boundaries of the school, is eagerly accepted and

warmly cherished. It is true that this may render the good of home a greater good than it would otherwise prove; but it also magnifies any evil which in any case may attach to it, while it makes the seductions of evil companionship irresistible. And only think how much danger there is that the evil, both within and without the precincts of home, should preponderate, when so many of the parents are either engaged in the factory, or other out-of-door employments, early and late, or offer to their children, in temper or in conduct, examples which it would be far better for them they should never behold. I can never regard it as any thing but a most unnatural and baneful state of things for the mother of a family to be found any where habitually, but in the midst of her domestic concerns. Hers is the influence which Nature designed to be the creator of her children's character. There is no influence equal to that which she sheds forth; no teacher of morality comparable for effect with the kindness of her eye and lip, the warmth of her heart, the gentleness, sincerity, and simplicity of her bearing. Unhappy the child that is severed from these fostering and guardian powers; more, infinitely more unhappy he or she in whose case these ministers of purity and love are replaced by the harsh tone, the tongue of violence and deceit, the oft uplifted hand, the brow of anger, and a life of intemperance. Even under the worst domestic training, and the greatest domestic neglect, a good school education will do something; but how much of its good will be frustrated, how much of its best influence will be overpowered in such a case; nay, there is a fear that the very knowledge which this school imparts, may be converted into power for evil, by the perverting influence of an immoral home. Yes! we must look to the parents as well as the instructors of the young. We must cleanse and enlighten the hearths of our cottages; we must strive to wean the father from guilty pleasure, and to take the mother out of the factory, and train her to love and pursue her domestic duties, ere we can reasonably expect to reap the natural rewards of a good system of popular education. And here let me bear my humble but earnest testimony to the need, the urgent need there is, for a good system of female education, especially in our manufacturing districts. The general remarks, indeed, which I made in the two previous papers, are designed to apply as much to the education of girls as to that of boys; but so long as the first are to continue to be drafted off at an early age into our factories, special efforts for their improvement, both during their school time and subsequently, are imperatively required. As it is—what, let me ask—what training does a girl engaged in factory labour receive, of a nature to prepare her for those maternal

duties which in all probability will devolve upon her? It is true that during the two or three years which intervene between her childhood and the time of her entering the factory, she may be employed in some domestic engagement, yet in very little that is better than nursing a younger child, and that alas! not seldom under circumstances trying to her temper and contaminating to her morals. I know, indeed, there are exceptions: I rejoice to know it. There are parents who, though left without school education, are yet pure in their conversation and kindly in their intercourses; whose homes are the abode of cleanliness, order, propriety, perhaps of the light and comfort of religion. The virtue of such persons is of the highest kind, practised and preserved as it is under most adverse circumstances. But I should speak from my wishes rather than my knowledge, did I affirm that they presented any thing more than rare and most honourable exceptions. The rule is more or less the reverse, and by general facts must my observations be governed. Well, then, after nursing for some two or three years a younger, perhaps a neglected, child, the girl is sent into the factory. Those who know how far the educational clauses in the last Factory Act are evaded, and how long and hard the labour still is, and what the moral atmosphere of a factory, will not look for any influence of a decidedly beneficial character either during or after the hours of occupation, still less for any training which shall prepare the girl for the duties of maternity. Soon, however, she earns by her own exertions a weekly sum, which she is aware would suffice for her own maintenance. She has in consequence a premature sense of independence, and either becomes exacting at home, if not refractory, or quits its precincts for a residence where she can be completely her own mistress. Left thus uncontrolled by others, and having little or no self-control, she expends what she can spare from food, in finery and unimproving pleasures, well if they are not degrading; and as, perhaps, the least injurious result, contracts an early marriage, enters upon relations of whose nature and importance she has scarcely any conception, and for whose duties she is almost wholly unprepared. If there is truth in this sketch, what can be expected? of the most ordinary domestic engagements, she is nearly ignorant; domestic habits she has not been trained to; personal and domestic neatness, propriety and comfort, she understands scarcely at all; her mind is uninformed; her character undisciplined, her temper unregulated. In consequence, home is not made pleasing and cheerful to her husband, he soon begins to seek out-door gratifications; she, perhaps, returns to the factory; a family comes on, but the parents are unable to prove a father and a mother to the mind and heart of

their children; unthriftiness prevails, then waste, then want, want sometimes in the midst of plenty; want creates dissatisfaction, mutual reproaches; quarrels lead to blows, blows bring on a separation; and thus a couple who at first may have entertained kindly feeling one to another, and have entered on life with bright fancies and fairy hopes, are involved in broils and other calamities which, with occasional alternations and abatements, may, alas! endure for life. What a waste have we here of the means of happiness; what a blighting of good feeling, what moral and social devastation. The cause of this? It is not in any defect of nature, nor in any unforeseen misfortune—it is ignorance—ignorance, that great bane of the poor man, that direful curse on his domestic happiness, that irreparable—yes! too often irreparable domestic calamity! Well, then, may I ask, nay I would beg and entreat that the females of our working population may receive such a training as may rescue them from moral ruin, from the sad necessity under which too many of them now lie—a necessity not of nature but of circumstances, that sad, that bitter necessity of entailing moral and social distress on those little ones whom at first, at least, they cherish as they do their own life. Nay, did the mother duly feel the bitterness of this necessity, a remedy would not be hopeless. The evil is, that for want of having their minds opened, they allow themselves to be drawn on by outward influences—unthinking whither they are hurrying them, till retreat is almost impossible. Otherwise that holy instinct—a mother's love—would exert its mighty power for the moral preservation of the young. And after all, even in the worst condition, did parents feel that their lot is still in their own hands, their lot, and in that, the lot of their family,—were they led to look rather at what they could do for themselves and for their offspring, than at what they expect—but often in vain, others will do for them;—I say almost even at the worst, the mother and father might and would exert some restraining and salutary influence. As it is, however, existing evils of the social system are aggravated by their own failures in duty. It should never be forgotten that a child could not enter a factory but by the act of the parents. It is they, in reality, who send children there; and I weep to say it, parents are found who thinking exclusively of the addition which may hence accrue to their own pecuniary means, thinking, perhaps exclusively, how they may work less or work not at all, or have more to spend in vitiating pleasures,—parents are found who, with no higher feeling than this, with no regard to a child's education, a child's welfare, or the welfare of that child's future family, will adopt even dishonest and unlawful means to pro-

cure for the child premature admission to those places of toil where it can, as a child, get no good, and must be fortunate, indeed, if it does not get much harm alike to its body, mind, and soul. There is no remedy for this afflicting evil, but in education. Laws will prove, as laws have proved, but sorry preventives, and, it may be, even stumbling blocks to parental virtue. We must enlighten our working population—above all, we must educate the future mothers of the industrious classes. I am fully aware that nothing can make up for the want of a domestic training. The mother is the best teacher of the daughter in all that concerns the future duties of that daughter in her own home. And I must declare it a most unnatural condition of society, when an influence is wanting which was designed of Providence to prepare females for the offices of domestic life; when a mother, instead of discharging the most sacred obligations in forming her girl's mind, heart, and character, in training her gently by her own example to skill in the several operations which family comfort requires—is either ignorant or scarcely half taught herself, or away from her home, engaged in making money, which rarely under the circumstances, very rarely conduces to happiness. Still, though we cannot replace, we may do something to supply a mother's care. It is the duty of the girl's school. And here too the principles should be studiously kept in view which I laid down respecting general popular education, and the questions must be—what does it most concern a girl to know?—what will she have to do? what will open out and expand with the increase of her duties, interests, and wants? In addition to the requirements I have already made—I say in addition, for certainly the education of the female ought in no wise to be inferior to that of the male—in addition, then, our girls' school must teach, and that not by rote but by practice and experience, the practical arts of domestic life—sewing, knitting, making and mending, baking, brewing, together with cooking; nor only this, it must train its inmates to personal neatness and propriety, to command their temper, to regulate their passions, to know and feel the importance of their actual and their coming duties; besides training them to habits of thrift, industry, and gentleness. And since it is obvious that the mind of a child does not and cannot open to many of the duties of the woman, there should be institutions to receive the children when they leave the school.—Institutions so ordered that their hours and discipline may be suited to young women engaged in manual labour, and presided over by matrons whose character would be a guarantee that all should be done which could be done, to bring up the pupils for a wise and efficient discharge of their

most important future obligations. This matter is one of vital interest to the working man. It is of small consequence what his earnings are, what his own habits at the first, what his own intelligence, if he has not a well-disposed, thrifty, and clever partner; without this, other advantages fail of much of their effect; his resources are squandered, his own habits vitiated; that intelligence which ought to have been the light of his home, as well as of his own mind, shows him only too strikingly the deficiencies of his wife and the extent of neglect which his children suffer; and beyond question, in the ordinary course of things, the last state of that man, and of that family, is worse, incomparably worse, than the first. No one, then, has so deep an interest in the proper education and training of the female portion of our industrious population, as the working man himself; and could the privations and afflictions which domestic ignorance inflicts upon him but too often, make him feel the impulses of a true benevolence towards the coming generation, he would think nothing of any small sacrifice he might have to make, in order to save his own sons and daughters from a heritage so mournful as his own. Most fervently do I wish we could see these generous impulses in active operation. It is not a small misfortune for the working classes that they have had their characters undermined by charity, and having thus lost no small portion of genuine independence, have been led to look to a stranger's hand for a supply of some of their highest wants, nor least of the means of education for their children. Would that there was no need of charity amongst them! Charity has, I know, its advantages, but the advantages of a manly independence are far superior. I want to see the working man stand erect in the full consciousness of his own earthly self-sufficiency, stand erect modestly, but firmly in his own bright hearth, with his partner and his little ones around him; and beholding their comfort and happiness, be able to say—"they eat not the bread of idleness or charity, they are not children of the charity-school, they wear the degrading badge of no party; their bodies I have fed and clothed; their minds I have had instructed out of the sweat of my brow; their hearts I will strive to form to the love of God and man, and then I trust in their turn, they will be able to provide for themselves and theirs in their own homes and owe no one any thing but good will!" And I must be allowed to think, that an education provided by the parents themselves would, in time, under wise and benevolent advice and aid, prove the best education our youthful poor could receive. It is a good general principle that each class can best make provision for its own wants. They best know what these wants are, can in

general devise the best means for supplying them, and certainly will be most faithful in the operations which result. And my first wish is, that the education of their children should be taken in hand by the working classes themselves—or at least that this should be steadily aimed at in whatever plans may be adopted; at all events may it be the final result of the efforts of the friends of education. That it is the duty of the parent to provide for the education of his child cannot be questioned. It is a duty which ranks second only to that of providing them with sustenance and clothing. It is a most sacred obligation. His own happiness, the happiness of his own flesh and blood, and the welfare of his country, are involved in it. It is a duty from which nothing but absolute want can exonerate him; and well may those who neglect it, who prefer selfish pleasures, public amusements, the agitations of politics, schemes of general usefulness—any phantom, or even any second-rate reality—who prefer these to the education of their children, well may they, at least they ought to, feel bitter compunction. And that they possess some ability for the purpose cannot be denied—perhaps a greater amount of ability than they themselves can imagine. At any rate, is it impossible for a parent to devote some hours on the Sunday, as well to the improvement of his children, as his own improvement? Could not one half hour be given each evening to the work? Even in cases where the parent can neither read nor write, he or she—both indeed—can inform the minds and train the hearts of their young ones as to their duties, interests, and hopes; what they should seek, what they should shun, and what frame of mind will best promote their welfare. Moreover, few, comparatively, are the families where a sufficient portion of the income might not be spared and set aside as school-money; and thus by individual exertion much might be done for the education of the youthful poor. But I am now brought to ANOTHER REQUISITE, and to the suggestion of the introduction into education of a principle which has been found efficacious in many other things—I mean the principle of association. I want the people in the main to rely on their own resources. If effectual aid come from other quarters, they will not be the worse off for making the effort; but should foreign assistance be withheld, they will have placed their hopes on a good foundation. Now it is not by any means the least valuable part of the information which the educational committee have supplied, that for the very sums of money which the people now expend in procuring a bad education—an education which is really no education—they might under judicious arrangements, secure a truly useful and permanently valuable sys-

tem of training for their children. The total cost of educating 11,624 children of both sexes in the dame and common schools of Manchester has been calculated by Dr. Kay to amount to £17,398. 2*s.*, whereas the total outlay which he contemplates for all the 25,000 children in Manchester, who require a good education, would be £18,600; that is to say, a good system would educate 25,000 children for £1,202. 18*s.* more than is now expended in a most defective and unworthy education for 11,624; the number of children is more than doubled, the expense increased by only one-seventeenth. I must, however, in fairness say, that I think Dr. Kay has underrated the expense which would attend on a good and efficient system of education. In a matter of this sort frugality may prove waste. It is enough to know that a large sum of money is expended by the working classes for which they have at present no adequate return, and that the same sum, if well laid out, would effect very much, if not all that they require. Let those whose children do not frequent school, and who therefore contribute nothing to the sums which Dr. Kay has taken into his calculations, let those parents pay their portion, and thus take steps for securing an education for their children, and little will remain for government to do, at least in our towns and cities. From these remarks it will be gathered that I am of opinion that parents have the ability to provide the pecuniary means for the proper education of their children. Such, undoubtedly, is my opinion. There may be exceptions. The hand-loom weavers are, I am afraid, too poor to be able to part with any of their most scanty resources. And bad times will affect others—but speaking in general terms, the people possess the means, I hope they also have the will, and require but to be aided in the way.

Self-supporting dispensaries are beginning to prevail; and with my views of the evils which a system of charity engenders, I cannot do otherwise than wish them God's speed. The plan is for a number of families to unite together, and contribute the means by which they and theirs may be furnished with medical aid in time of need. Why cannot the same plan be adopted in education? The working classes have already in existence many associated bodies, which might easily and most beneficially undertake the needful arrangements. Nor is it a disparagement of any of their existing objects to say, that to concern themselves in their societies, unions, and clubs, about the education of their children, would be more useful, and more conducive to the extension of their liberties, and the furtherance of their welfare, as a class, than many a plan which may now engage their affections. Or if it is useless to look to these quarters for the introduc-

tion of the efficiency of Association into popular education, then where can be the difficulty of forming local unions for the purpose? Few localities are without some person of superior enlightenment, from whom the germ might go forth—who by a little exertion might associate together a sufficient number of families for the purpose of providing out of their own resources means for the education of their children. Indeed the very principle exists already, though in no very satisfactory state, in "sick and burial clubs." Now, how painful is the thought, that a provision is made on the plan of mutual help, for replacing a child's earnings, and consigning its body to the earth, in case of sickness or death—but none for its life, its mind, its character—for that, in short, which, should the child live, that and that only which will make life worth having. The reader will already have become aware that I am not a friend to large schools. One hundred boys are too many for a master and an assistant. Let us, however, say one hundred. Now, on an average, perhaps, every family would supply at least two children requiring education. Fifty families, then, would form a school union. Let sixpence a week be paid for each child; that is, one shilling a week by each head of a family. Let it be compulsory that this should be paid during the year; and a certain income of fifty shillings a week, or one hundred and thirty pounds a year, would be secured. Let this not be thought too much. It is bad thrift indeed to pay your educators ill. But for the guaranteed salary of one hundred and thirty pounds a year, a competent master would in time be secured, who should make his own arrangements for procuring an assistant, which in all cases should be considered indispensable. But whence, I may be asked, are school-rooms, play-grounds, and school apparatus to come? I should like to have the experiment made, for I am of opinion that the salary I have named would do much to bring every needful auxiliary. Few localities, at least in our towns, are without some large rooms which might be turned to account; and then, are there not the rooms in which Sunday schools are taught—the greater part left unoccupied during at least one hundred and sixty hours of the one hundred and sixty-eight of which every week consists. Nor can I think it impossible for the working classes themselves, by proper organization, to have school-rooms erected where none already exist. Sure I am, if funds could be advanced under suitable regulations, the people would soon be able to repay them out of the savings which might ensue, from transacting in these rooms the business of their clubs and unions, instead of resorting, as they now generally do, to the public-house, where all have to pay a rent, not the less extravagant because it is indirect, and

where many barter away their resources and their character for pleasures which are contemptible in themselves, and baneful to the working man's family.

In agricultural districts, these suggestions would not, perhaps, prove practicable without important modifications; but I am concerned with the education more particularly of our towns and manufacturing villages, and I cannot but think that the plan I have mentioned is easy of adoption, and would work most beneficially. Certainly it would avoid many causes of the jealousy that some working men may entertain against plans of education which put a new influence into the hands of the wealthy or aristocratic classes of society. Nor is it its least recommendation that it would evade altogether that ecclesiastical strife and distrust by which the churchman and dissenter have, in this kingdom, prevented the establishment of a general national system of popular education.

It may indeed be a fond conceit, but I must say that I am very desirous that this suggestion should be known, canvassed, and tried: and so anxious am I that the people should be led to look exclusively to themselves for the supply of their own wants, and be no further weakened in the very vitals of their strength, independence, and happiness, by the extension of the charity system, that I am somewhat unwilling to divert the mind of my reader from this to any other resource.

It may, however, be pleaded, that some pecuniary assistance would be indispensable. If so, let the operation of the charity system be kept away, and let the resources which shall be found of absolute necessity, be sought for in quarters where the plea of right may be preferred and sustained on the part of the people. Now millions of property exist in this kingdom designed by the donors for the furtherance of education, but which is either useless, or less useful than it might be made,—who has so good a claim to this as the bulk of the nation? Here are resources ample enough for all our wants. There is perhaps even more, more in amount, and more in annual income, than with my views of the value of independence, and of the people's furnishing the supply of their own wants, I should like them to make use of. However, there is enough to provide school houses and school apparatus, to establish normal or model schools, and to establish seminaries for the education and training of popular educators. More than this I do not ask. Let the people furnish the teacher's salary out of their own earnings. It is an effort which they ought to make, which it will do them good to make, which it will be for their children's advantage they should make. I may add, they will estimate more

highly the education they pay for, and they will in time take effectual care that that for which they expend their money is the best of its kind. At least, if this supervision—the supervision of the parent, is not all that could be wished, it is not likely to be improved under a system of charity, or if our popular schools were subjected to the many defects of committee-management. Should it, however, be required that a part of the master's salary should come from some other source than the means of the parents—the whole of it I can by no means allow to proceed from any other source—should, however, a part be demanded, and should it be maintained that thus the independence of the master would be best upheld, and a judicious choice of masters be most effectually secured when there is a joint action of the richer and the poorer, the more and the less instructed classes, in providing the means of popular education, then let the required resources be furnished by a local tax, a tax assessed, and its expenditure directed, under popular control —a tax on all the members of each community, inasmuch as all are more or less, but all deeply, interested in the results of popular education.

I must mention *one more requisite*—it is time. Without time nothing can be done. As the custom is of sending children into our factories, there is not scope even for their physical education, much less their intellectual and moral culture. They are occupied too early, far too early in life, and too long each day, to allow of the requisite discipline. I cannot think without pain, of young children being enslaved to any severe bodily employment. It is a part of a system of intense and exhausting toil which prevails in this country, and which, undiversified as it is by suitable recreations, amusements, and refinements, threatens to undermine the strength, as it has already done something to undermine the virtue of our working population. And if the physical effects on the existing generation of adults have been less injurious than might be expected, it is probably attributable to the fact, that many of those who are engaged in these oppressive bodily pursuits, brought with them out of the country situations in which they were reared, the hale and robust constitutions which such situations, nor least, the outdoor labour incident to them, are calculated to form. May we not, however, be justified in looking with apprehension to the rising race, and to their offspring, when our children are brought up not in the pure air of heaven, but in the narrow limits, elevated temperature, and impure air of the factory and workshop? I fear for the result. I do not indeed profess to give implicit credit to the tales that are current as to the bane-

ful effects of factories on the health of their inmates. I have no doubt but that party politics have chosen the factories as an advantageous field of battle. With efforts of this nature I have no fellow-feeling; but on general principles, principles which are based on the laws of human well-being, I am forced to believe that this early labour in these comparatively confined precincts, must be injurious to the body, dwarfing to the mind, and detrimental to the morals.

It is with me an unquestionable fact, that Nature designed no small period of early life to be spent in healthful play—in that exercise of the frame, that invigorating and joyous exercise which children so well know how to give themselves, when left to indulge their own impulses in the free breath and under the uncovered eye of day. Look at the child who enjoys what I may term natural air and exercise—who wanders at will over the earth—climbs its hills or its mountains, bathes in its rivers or seas, plucks its flowers, inhales its breezes—look at his ruddy cheeks, his bright glad eye, hear his hearty laugh, and notice his strong and well-proportioned frame:—then turn to the factory child, on a summer's morn, when every thing within and without him, conspires to call him abroad into the green fields, sauntering heavily on to his labour:—or in the depth of winter, chilled or wet with rain hurrying through the inclement weather, to the gas-lighted morning task, at which he will have to keep as long as nature furnishes her overplied energies—look at these two children, mark the contrast—the contrast of their circumstances, the contrast in their spirits and their prospects, and then say which of the two is likely to prove the more successful scholar; nay, whether there is any hope that he whose bodily frame is laden as heavily as its physical powers can bear, offers any prospect of satisfactory mental or moral improvement. Little can be done till the educator has the young under his charge, at least nearly all the time that can be spared from play and recreation. If we would have a robust and happy peasantry—a people possessed of both the ability and the will to fulfil the duties of mature life, we must take effectual measures to shield the young from the exhaustion consequent on premature bodily labour. Indeed, up to the age of twelve, if not fourteen, the time of a child should mainly be spent in education—in play the education of the body, and study the education of the mind. And here again I would remind the parent, that with him lies the determination of the question, with him almost exclusively, certainly far more than with the legislature. If only parents were made sensible of what the welfare of their children requires, and were so enlightened and self-denying as

to resolve to make that welfare a consideration paramount to every other, I should have good hope, nay an assurance, that the time which is indispensably necessary for the education of their offspring, would be kept free from entrenchment. Either by their own act or by their influence on legislation, their children would be preserved from severe labour until their bodies were in some good measure prepared, and their mind informed, disciplined and strengthened.

J. R. B.

## Art. IV.—AN INQUIRY INTO THE DOCTRINE OF THE INNATE CORRUPTION OF HUMAN NATURE; BEING AN EXAMINATION OF THOSE PARTS OF SCRIPTURE ON WHICH IT HAS BEEN FOUNDED.

In the present times, it requires no small amount of moral courage to attempt openly to inquire into the truth of any doctrine, announced as infallible by those who have obtained the privilege of directing the religious concerns of Christians. Society is so deeply impressed by the belief that inquiry is not only unnecessary, but sinful, as to make it imperative on every one who dares to think for himself, and to make known opinions differing from such as have been promulgated, to reconcile himself to a kind of moral banishment from among his acquaintances, and sometimes even from among his connections and relations. It is lamentable to think that a man dare not attach his name to any discussion calling in question the doctrines of men, lest he should offend and estrange those with whom he is connected by the ties of friendship, or bonds yet more dear. Jesus Christ said truly, he came not to bring peace, but a sword; and described correctly what the condition of families would be. The accuracy of his judgment of human nature, unenlightened and misdirected, is proved abundantly by the present state of the Christian world. The contemplation of this is painful; but the cause of justice and truth must not be forsaken.

Whatever degree of confidence may be given to men, who make Christianity their especial study, when we find such men differing widely among themselves in reference to points of belief, it is certain there must be something in the object of their study that is not clearly defined, and consequently not suited to the comprehension of all. Were this not the case, there could be no difference of opinion. The fact, however, being that there is, it is surely more becoming the dignity of man's intellectual nature that each individual should inquire for himself, than to prostrate his reason, which God has given to him, before other men, without inquiry, or having any rational foundation for belief. As the Psalmist says, "It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man."

There is no command more frequently issued from the pulpit than this,—Search the Scriptures. What is the meaning of this command? Is it that we should open the Bible, read it without reflection, and again shut it? Or does it mean that

we should read, examine whether what we read be true or false, and satisfy our minds in reference to what is worthy of belief, and what is unworthy? No person of sane mind and sound judgment, can hesitate to pronounce the latter to be the true meaning of the command. But it is nevertheless certain, that those who bid us search the Scriptures, if we come to any conclusion different from their own, and leading us to doubt the accuracy of *their* interpretations, instantly doom us to everlasting perdition. This is rather a summary mode of rectifying error; and it has its effect on all persons who dislike the trouble of reflective research, or who are incapable of it, or whose ignorance, arising from dogmatic or imperfect education, may have rendered them timid and superstitious. It is not calculated to raise those who employ such means to establish doctrines, in the estimation of the wise and prudent; because it indicates not only pride, and the absence of Christian charity, but a conspiracy against freedom of thought and liberty of conscience. And more than that, it indicates fear, lest obedience to their own command to search the Scriptures should lead to their own condemnation.

It is exceedingly unfortunate, that while the human mind is rapidly improving its powers, its efforts in a study so important as that of religion, should be disturbed by the notion, that certain ancient doctrines are unimpeachable, and the human authorities who framed them infallible. It is equally unfortunate that mankind should imagine those who have lived and are no more, to have possessed talents of superior power to those with which their posterity has been blessed; that they were more learned and able translators and commentators than any who might appear in after times. The disputes which were carried on in former times, when volumes were written of almost incredible number and bulk, about points of doctrine, as well as the differences that subsist at the present day, seem to be very inconsistent with the name given to that which contains the matter of dispute—*revelation*. That word strictly means an explanation, or a manifestation, of something not before understood. But as very different meanings are given to various parts of the Bible, and as the book specially called the book of revelation is the most dark and incomprehensible of all, it certainly appears very strange that the word should be applied to any thing doubtful, or unintelligible.

There is yet another thing that depresses inquiry, the kingly and legal sanction given to what is emphatically styled, the *authorized* version of the Bible. Kings and councils are no wiser than other men; and why the strong arm of power should

command that no meaning shall be given to the original language than that which power dictates, or that such command should be obeyed, is not easily perceived. Yet what is called *established* authority goes a great way with understandings that are darkened, and which blindly receive as true and faithful that which may be full of error. No inspired writer has given us the Bible in *our* language. We possess it on human authority alone.

Every one knows that the Roman Church, with the view to preserve uniformity of Creed, and consequently its power, not only withheld the Bible from the people altogether, but performed worship in a language which the people did not understand. Numbers of the priesthood were kept in ignorance, and many of them could neither write nor read. When, however, the Bible came to be known, disputes about its meaning arose, and various doctrines were founded upon the various interpretations and constructions which men chose to put upon its contents. Those points are not yet settled, and Christians are divided into numerous bodies, each giving particular interpretations, and condemning those of others as false.

In treating of the supposed innate corruption of human nature, it is proposed to assume the authorized translation of the Bible as correct, and to take its expressions as conveying no other meaning than that which the words are understood to convey in their ordinary and general acceptation. There is another authorized work to which it is necessary to refer, because it is the creed of the churches established in Great Britain, and which has for its title 'The Westminster confession of Faith,' because the doctrines it contains were agreed upon by a convocation of Divines which assembled at Westminster for the purpose of settling a creed. In this we have the texts of Scripture quoted, on which these divines affirm the doctrines of the confession to be founded, so that every one has the means of satisfying himself whether the doctrines adopted rest on just premises and just conclusions, or otherwise.

In order to understand clearly what is meant by the doctrine which declares man's nature to be corrupted and depraved, it is necessary that we should know what his condition was before he became corrupted. We surely ought to find means for ascertaining this in the same source whence the doctrine has been derived, and therefore let us examine it.

It is there said that God created man in his own image or likeness: as it is also there said that no man hath seen God at any time, it may appear difficult to imagine on what authority the historian of creation and of the earlier ages of the world

makes the affirmation. Many suppositions have been made respecting this matter; and as God is represented as a Spirit, a condition of being about which we can form no conception, divines have affirmed the likeness to be a spiritual likeness. But unless we can conceive what *Spirit* really means, and which we cannot, it is impossible to have any idea of a spiritual likeness. Though divines have announced that God has no body, nor parts, they continually speak of Him as having parts. There are passages in the Bible which seem to justify the historian in affirming that man was created in the image of God. Moses, in the history attributed to him, narrates that he had expressed to God a great anxiety that He should manifest himself to him. We read in the thirty-third Chapter of Exodus, at the twentieth verse, "And He said, thou canst not see my face; for there shall no man see me and live. And the Lord said, Behold there is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock; and it shall come to pass while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a cleft of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by, and I will take away mine hand, and thou shalt see my back parts; but my face shall not be seen." It is said in the third chapter of Genesis, at the eighth verse, "And they (Adam and Eve) heard the voice of the Lord, walking in the garden in the cool of the day." From these and other passages we are led to perceive that, granting the history to have divine authority stamped upon it, God has a face, and hands, and feet. Therefore it was correct to say that man was created in the image of God, after His likeness. There is nothing so common in religious feeling and worship as giving Form to God.* The same divines who, before they are admitted to the sacred office, are under the obligation to subscribe the Confession of Faith as their belief, never hesitate to preach that Christ sitteth or standeth at the *right hand* of God. Nor do they ever think of denying the affirmation of Stephen, and to which he owed his martyrdom, that he actually saw Christ so standing. To labour, therefore, in any attempt to give any other than a literal meaning to any portion of the Bible, is nothing less than to cast an air of doubt over the whole of it. Because if we admit the legitimacy of any attempt to explain, and to give other than a literal meaning to one portion, it must be admitted in reference to every other portion, and thus the whole might be

[* It is only as an "*argumentum ad hominem*" we can admit the truth of the statements and reasonings in the text: as applicable to the inconsistencies of Divines they are pertinent and forcible.—Ed.]

frittered away, and completely altered and disguised so as to suit any particular purpose. The difficulty in our way here is, that we have no definition of a spirit. One notion of it is, that a spirit has not flesh and bones; a notion imbibed from what Christ uttered after his resurrection. But it may be remarked that he did not scout the idea of a spirit having Form; he only said it had not flesh and bones. It is our absolute ignorance of what we call spiritual existence that occasions our being puzzled; for we cannot imagine any thing having form that does not occupy space, and is not material. We ought, however, to consider that we have no authority whatever for imagining that a spirit is immaterial. One vulgar notion of spirits is, that they have power to become invisible, or visible at pleasure. Now, if a spirit become visible, it is evident that it is so far material as to affect that kind of matter called Light, otherwise we could not see it. There are material things so subtile as to be invisible. The cause which attracts a small body to a greater is invisible. The elective fluid is invisible until it comes into a condition to emit light, with which it is either itself compounded, or in its passage it causes light to be emitted from the medium which it traverses. From these considerations we may draw the inference that spirit does not *necessarily* mean any thing that cannot be seen and has no form. We can conceive what no existence is; of empty space; but we cannot conceive an existence without the occupation of space. Now, if we admit the credibility of the Mosaic history of Creation, we must believe that if man be in the likeness of God, if God walked in the Garden, if He placed His hand upon Moses, and if Christ sits at the right hand of God, the Creator must be of a nature that admits the occupation of space, and consequently must have form. Nor is it inconsistent with the notion of form that God should possess all the attributes ascribed to Him. His intelligence may be infinite, His ears may receive sounds however remote, and distinguish each, however great the multitude and confusion. His eye may penetrate through space; and even light may not be necessary for Him to see. If He has given to light the property to move with a velocity scarcely within our comprehension, His omnipresence may be conceived; for every power and property conferred must be possessed by the Being conferring them, in a degree immeasureably higher than the one receiving them. As we know that other created beings have senses and powers which we do not possess, the Intelligence which gave existence to all things, however beyond our powers to estimate, may be conceived not to be incompatible with form, and to be embodied, though in a very different

manner, from our Intelligence. The idea of form, as a property necessary to every thing that exists, is so natural to us, that when the idea of God is present to the mind, form is present at the same time.

From the foregoing considerations, as well as from the circumstance of form being ascribed to God throughout the Bible, we are justified in forming such notions, and in vindicating the historian. Yet so anxious were the Divines assembled at Westminster to contradict him and other Bible writers in this and other points, that in the Confession of Faith God is described as a Being "without Body, Parts, or Passions." With respect to body, they may be correct if it be meant that God's body is not composed of the same materials as our bodies: but in reference to parts, it is inconceivable to us that God Himself should be believed to have spoken without parts for speech, and to have Himself named His face and His hands, having neither. With respect to passions, it is most surprising we should be told that God has none, by Divines, who are, as Divines have always been, in the constant practice of attempting to terrify us by threatening God's wrath and His vengeance, or of soothing us by speaking of His compassion and slowness to anger. The same divines believe the truth of the histories which represent God as cruel and vindictive, and bringing judgments on men, and yet insist on our believing that He is a being without passions. If the whole Bible is to be believed, we cannot believe the whole Confession of Faith. This part of the condition of Man as originally created need not detain us longer. We need not dispute that he was created in the image of God.

The next inquiry is of greater importance, inasmuch as it relates to the moral condition of man; and we are entitled to expect that we shall find this clearly laid down in the Bible. It is necessary, however, before entering on this most interesting and indispensable inquiry, to state the admitted moral attributes of God, and to keep them constantly in view. We will state them in the form of postulates, because no one professing Christianity doubts them, and because no Deist who acknowledges there is such a thing as Morality can deny them.

I. God is a Being perfectly and infinitely Intelligent.

II. God is a Being perfectly Just.

III. God is a Being perfectly Benevolent, tempering His Justice with Mercy.

IV. God is a Being who cannot act in contradiction to His Justice and Mercy and Intelligence; nor to His own words or acts.

These propositions being admitted, ought to regulate,

1. Our consideration of the evidences offered in support of any religion, and of the Christian religion in particular, as modified by human authority.

2. Our consideration of the correctness of any Doctrine or Creed offered to our acceptance.

3. Our motives for obedience to religious bodies, or churches incorporated by the laws of any country; or for joining any religious bodies voluntarily associated, and receiving no protection from human law; or for remaining independent of all religious associations.

Every one ought to exercise reason before adopting any religion whatever; and before the process of reasoning is commenced, the propositions that have been stated must be admitted by every one endowed with moral feeling; because if they be not admitted, the Deity being, in that case, placed in respect to character on a level with ourselves, could not be worthy of adoration and love, and would necessarily be an object of hatred and fear. Unfortunately for the bulk of mankind, religious impressions are made on the mind before the reasoning powers arrive at maturity; and the consequence is, that the religion of multitudes, having no sure foundation, becomes either neglected, or entirely superstitious.

In all religions, Zealots, Bigots, and Fanatics exist; and while every one of sound mind, and constituted with a proper share of moral feeling, can have compassion on such persons on account of their mental aberrations, and even forgive them for the mischief which they operate on human nature, we cannot so easily forgive those who, for the sake of power, and the good things of this world, threaten with eternal perdition every man who dares to use his reason, as God intended it should be used, in separating truth from falsehood, and who refuses to trample it under foot, and to believe whatever they please to dictate.

Such, then, being the situation in which we are placed, we ought, in every religious inquiry, to set aside all impressions made upon us in childhood, when the mental powers are unfit to weigh truth and falsehood against each other; and to present ourselves before the God who gave us reason, accepting with perfect humility the means He has bestowed upon us for discovering truth, and using them honestly and calmly: so that to whatever conclusion we come, we may throw ourselves on His unbounded Benevolence, in the perfect confidence that, having employed our talents diligently and faithfully, we shall be accepted by Him, although our reasoning be imperfect, and our errors may be numerous. Thus prepared with the only foundation on which all reasoning on religious subjects should rest, we

may now proceed to search for such particulars relating to the moral condition of man at his creation, as are furnished by the Mosaic history.

In the second chapter of Genesis, beginning at the sixteenth verse, we find the following passage: "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." These words demand the most serious attention, because they are the groundwork of the doctrine into the truth of which we are to inquire, and which takes it for granted that man at his creation was a perfect being. Man could not, at his creation, have been a perfect being, because it was necessary to impose a command upon him. He must have been liable to yield to temptation, because if he had not been liable, it would not have been necessary to threaten him with punishment. The nature of the temptation had a direct reference to man's moral condition. That condition was, partly, that he was ignorant of good and evil, and, consequently, of the distinction between them. That man was so, is clearly proved by another passage of the history, which narrates the consequences of his having yielded to the temptation placed in his way. We find it written at the twenty-second verse of the third chapter, "And the Lord God said, Behold the man has become as one of us, to know good and evil." If man had, previously to his eating of the forbidden fruit, known good and evil, God could not have expressed the consequence in this manner. Nothing can be more clear and distinct. Man, therefore, having been ignorant of good and evil, the question naturally occurs, what is good and what is evil? On the proper understanding of these words a vast deal more depends than a superficial reader may imagine.

These terms may be defined thus: *good* means every thing by which our faculties are agreeably affected; and *evil* every thing by which they are disagreeably affected.

We now ask, in what moral condition could a human being be considered, whose faculties could not be affected either agreeably or disagreeably? The Confession of Faith tells us that man, at his creation, "had the law of God written in his heart, and power to fulfil it." According to this statement, man must have known that which was *right*, and that which was *wrong*; such knowledge constituting him a responsible being. But to know that which was right, the faculty which takes cognizance of right and wrong must have been capable of being agreeably affected

by every thing right, and have esteemed every thing that was right to be good; and must have been capable of being disagreeably affected by every thing wrong, and have esteemed every thing wrong to be evil. But we are expressly informed in the Scriptures, that man was created ignorant of good and evil, and consequently he could have had no law written in his heart; and he could not have sinned against a law which he could not comprehend.

Another difficulty besets us here, of a magnitude that is very serious. We have seen that man was ignorant of good and evil, and consequently of right and wrong. A being so constituted is not held by human law to be responsible for his actions. The consciousness of what is right and of what is wrong, is held by the law of man to be necessary to constitute responsibility; and all persons void of such consciousness, who may have committed actions which would have rendered other persons having that consciousness amenable to the law, are acquitted.

Now, if, as we have seen, man was actually ignorant of good and evil at his creation, he must have been incapable of understanding a threat of punishment. Punishment is evil; and all evil connected with our present state is punishment on account of our disobeying the laws impressed on the great system of nature of which man forms a part. To a being ignorant of evil—if punishment be an evil—a threat of punishment can be of no avail, because he knows not what it is that constitutes the threat—he cannot regard a threat; and consequent fear of punishment as an evil, cannot exist, as an inducement to obey a command. Privation of life is an evil, and esteemed one of great magnitude. A threat of suffering such a privation to a being who could not perceive the evil of it, must go for nothing. The difficulty therefore is, that if we believe God to possess the attributes ascribed to Him, we cannot believe Him to be capable of uttering a threat to a being who had not power to comprehend it.

We must now look into the view of the history taken by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster. We find that from the same premises they draw very different conclusions, and we shall presently see the grounds on which they deemed themselves justified. They tell us that the consequence of man having eaten of the forbidden fruit was, that he became "WHOLLY DEFILED IN ALL THE FACULTIES AND PARTS OF SOUL AND BODY."

How this can be reconciled to a fact, which by all divines must be regarded as undeniable, viz., that *according to God's*

*own declaration,* man became as Himself, and those whom He addressed, to know good and evil, it is not easy to comprehend. God said, "Man is become *as one of us;*" and therefore if the conclusion of the divines be just, they must have conceived that God and those whom He addressed were "wholly defiled."

So far from exciting the idea that the moral condition of man became worse, the above declaration leads us to the direct conclusion that it was greatly improved. The change was evidently from a lower to a higher state of Intelligence; from a state of unconsciousness of right and wrong, to a perfect knowledge of both; from a state of irresponsibility to one of responsibility.

There is a matter connected with corruption, and on which divines insist, viz., that man at his creation was not subject to death. This opinion we may shortly examine. God said to the man, in reference to the forbidden fruit, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." It may be asked, if man was not previously subject to death, how *could* he die? As the history tells us that, notwithstanding the threat, he did not die, the contradiction is attempted to be got rid of by supposing it was meant the man should *become* subject to death. There appears nothing in the history to justify this supposition, but the contrary. Let us read the whole of the twenty-second verse of the third chapter, part of which has been already referred to. "And the Lord God said, And behold, the man has become as one of us, to know good and evil, and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever; therefore," &c. This appears to draw a clear distinction between what the condition of man was, and what it would have been had he eaten of *both* fruits. The one changed his mental state, and the other would have changed his corporeal state. Death was the punishment threatened; but is not announced to have been the consequence of the disobedience. The consequence is clearly announced in the words, "Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil." And lest he should have approached still nearer to the divine nature, he was removed from the tree of life, and made to continue mortal.

There are other reasons for denying the supposition that man was not subject to death at his creation. Following the Mosaic history as our guide to matters of fact, we find it written in the twenty-eighth verse of the first chapter of Genesis, "And God blessed them; and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth." This was said before the forbidden fruit was eaten. Now supposing that man had not been subject to death, the question arises, what time would elapse in

the progress of multiplying, before the earth was replenished? It is obvious that, man being supposed immortal, a time would soon come when there would not be standing room for him on the earth. To get rid of this difficulty another hypothesis became necessary, but for which there is no warrant, viz., that after man had multiplied to a certain extent, a proportion would be taken away, and transferred to another region, to heaven. That this supposition is unwarranted, appears from what we learn from the twenty-ninth verse of the first chapter, "Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree in which there is the fruit of a tree yielding seeds, to you it shall be for meat." Why were these given for meat? The natural answer is, to support life. But is a being not subject to death under any necessity to support life? Those who advocate the notion, that man was not subject to death, must show that an immortal being requires sustenance, else the hypothesis appears absurd.

From what has been advanced, appealing to the record itself, there does not appear to be any rational foundation for the invention of the doctrine of the corruption of man's nature, in consequence of his having eaten the forbidden fruit. On the contrary, there is good reason, supposing the history true, and not fabulous, for believing that man passed into a higher scale of being, becoming a moral being. The inventors, however, have quoted, in the Confession of Faith, all the detached texts they could find as likely to corroborate the doctrine, and some of these it is but justice to examine, lest in any of them we should find reasons more powerful in favour of it than those we have advanced against it. We find these texts appended as notes to the second article of chapter sixth. We shall take some of them in the order in which they are set down.

Genesis iii. 6.—"And when the woman saw the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave unto her husband and he did eat."

Here the facts are simply stated, and with perfect distinctness. That the first pair did eat of the fruit, is one simple fact. But one of the reasons why the woman ate of it, because "she saw the tree was to be desired *to make one* WISE," is too important to be slightly passed over. If she had been wise in her original condition, she could have had no desire to become so. Her desire to eat of the fruit was excited on account of her anxiety to become, *what she was not before,* wise. This, then, adduced as a proof of the doctrine, which assumes that man was in a more perfect state before, than after the fruit was eaten, flatly con-

tradicts that assumption. It confirms, in a remarkable manner, what we have endeavoured to show must have been the original moral condition of man, if the Mosaic history be credited by the supporters of the doctrine.

iii. 7.—"And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked, and they sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons." As already remarked, God had named the tree that of the knowledge of good and evil. God is likewise stated to have said, that the consequence of the man and woman having eaten of the fruit, was no other thing but their "becoming as one of us, knowing good and evil." In the verse just quoted as one of the grounds for the doctrine of corruption, the effect is confined to the discovery of their being destitute of clothing. What then was their state of intelligence before they knew this? It must have been that they had no sense of modesty. If to have acquired a sense of modesty be to be "wholly defiled," it is a kind of corruption in our nature of which few theologians, if moral men, would wish man to be devoid.

iii. 8.—"And they heard the voice of the Lord walking in the garden in the cool of the day; and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord, amongst the trees of the garden." This is quoted as a proof of total defilement. It would have been but fair to have added the reason why they hid themselves, which is stated in a subsequent verse. "I was afraid, because I was naked." So it appears that the acquirement of a sense of modesty was defilement in the eyes of the divines.

These are all the facts that could be found in the history of the first pair, on which the doctrine is founded. We shall now consider others.

Ecclesiastes vii. 29.—"So, this only have I found, that God made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." There are two distinct statements in this verse. The first, God hath made man upright. This is given as an accurate translation, not of the language of the historian of creation, but of another writer who appeared long after Moses. The words make no allusion to the state of man originally, as connected with a second state. Had the writer said, God made the first man originally upright, there might have been a definite meaning, to which the supporters of the doctrine might have appealed. The expression, however, refers to the idea of the writer respecting the condition of man, as it was when he was created—as naturally upright; but as swerving afterwards from uprightness, on account of having sought out many inventions; not on account of his having eaten of the forbidden fruit.—We may here

introduce from another part of scripture, what appears conclusive of this being the proper meaning of the words of Ecclesiastes, and of the erroneousness of the doctrine. It was said by Jesus Christ, "that joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance." We infer from these words, that persons denominated just, did exist in the world. If this had not been the case, the comparison could not have been made; or if made, could not have been comprehended. Admitting the fact on such authority, it contradicts the doctrine; because, if all the descendants of Adam were, "wholly defiled in all the faculties, and parts of soul and body," it is impossible to conceive that any of them could be just, and need no repentance. The Apostle Paul says, "for when the Gentiles which have not the law, *do by nature* the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts." Here the Apostle who is chiefly appealed to in the concoction of the doctrine, confirms what Christ said, in a most remarkable manner. He tells us that, *by nature*, some men fulfil the law; that is, that they are just persons. The divines who composed the collection of doctrines in the Confession of Faith, tell us that at his creation, "man had the law written in his heart, and power to fulfil it," as the grand distinction between his perfect first state, and his corrupted second state. But St. Paul tells us plainly that, in his time, men existed who also "had the law written in their hearts," and who fulfilled it. The conclusion from these statements is most decidedly against the doctrine.

Ecclesiastes, as quoted above, is right in declaring that God made man upright; and we consider him also correct in his theory of man having become otherwise,—"but he has sought out many inventions." He has been led away into the abuse of what is intrinsically and originally good, not in consequence of having acquired a knowledge of good and evil, (which has been given him to keep him from the latter,) but of having neglected the fact of his having been made part of a system, conformable to it, and bound to obey its laws as soon as he discovers them, and equally bound to search for them.

Now let us return to the supposed proofs of the doctrine in question.

Romans iii. 23.—"For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." We have no disposition to deny this. For even just persons, such as the apostle describes, can scarcely affirm that they have not in some respect or other sinned. But we affirm, that if St. Paul, in the above sentence, alludes to

man's nature having become defiled, in the sense of the doctrine of corruption, he flatly contradicts what he himself had previously written, and what Christ said. If all had sinned and come short of the glory of God, in consequence of the first pair having eaten of the forbidden fruit, no one could be blamed for this, since it was an unavoidable consequence, to remove which Christians believe Christ to have appeared. But that sin was not the consequence, and that man had the power to walk uprightly, and was liable to punishment, if he did not so walk, is clear from the denunciations against wickedness, which we find dispersed through the histories in the Bible. God never could have spoken by His prophets, threatening judgments for that which He Himself had brought about, and which He, according to another Christian doctrine, was anxious to undo, and after reflecting during some thousands of years, at length devised the plan, to satisfy His own conscientious scruples, of sending Jesus Christ into the world. The mission of Christ, however, does not appear to have undone the curse, for man continues to sin, certainly in no less a degree, though it may be in a manner more refined. It would be well if Christian teachers, and those who are taught, were to keep before them the attributes they ascribe to God, and avoid holding Him forth as acting in opposition to them. Men, it is to be feared, are too apt to imagine themselves the pattern, and that God would act just as they would do. But if they would keep in mind a saying by which churchmen often try to evade argument, that God's ways are not as our ways; if they would first lay down a rule of morality which could not be departed from by a wise and good man; if they would but take the guidance of common sense, when they set about the invention of doctrine, it is probable that the great bulk of mankind would agree in matters of religion, come to see their true interests resting on justice, truth, and moderation of desire, and that the religion taught by Jesus Christ, when divested of the fable, the mystery, and the doctrine, that the cunning of men has wrapt around it, was the true religion of the One God, whom he called his Father, and who is our Father also. Even over this pure and simple religion, which the Jews had the great merit of preserving amidst the grossest idolatries and superstitions, much unnecessary obscurity has been thrown, even by the Jews themselves, who, like the rest of mankind, through ignorance of the constitution of man in relation to external things, and the laws which bind him to all nature, have fallen into error. Among the Jews, knowledge has been increasing; and while they have differed among themselves in reference to the light in which some of the

contents of their sacred books are to be viewed, they are, nevertheless, as one.*

The foregoing quotations in the Confession of Faith were made by its authors to confirm the proposition that the first pair "fell from their original righteousness and communion with God." The next proposition attempted to be proved is, that they "became dead in sin."

Genesis ii. 17.—"But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." As the man and woman did not die in consequence of eating of the tree, it became necessary for the divines, in order to escape the contradiction in the history, to suppose that the word "die" meant "becoming dead in sin." But we are not to assume the meaning to be what is supposed by them; we must take the word as the first pair understood it. That they understood it in its literal sense, appears from its having been necessary for the serpent to *assure* the woman, when she described the penalty which she dreaded, that she would *not* die. She did not fear becoming *dead in sin,* but simply dying like the creatures around her.

We do not find it recorded that our first parents were guilty of any second offence. The punishment of the first is distinctly narrated; but there is not the slightest hint of their original nature having been changed, nor of any such thing as their posterity being doomed to partake in their change. There is nothing certainly in the above quotation to justify any such conclusion. The only other text quoted in support of it is, Epistle to the Ephesians, v. 1. "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins." This was addressed to the people of Ephesus; and the sense in which any unbiassed person would understand the matter is, that before they were informed of the preaching of Christ, they had been great sinners, but had become better men. If the doctrine be correct, they could not have got rid of the defilement; because all men, according to it, are defiled in consequence of a

* It is a remarkable sign of the times, that the churches established by the arm of the law should be totally regardless of what he whom they regard as their master said, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." Of this the Roman catholics are aware, and they have no doctrinal dissensions. The protestants alone are divided; and it is impossible that each division of them can be right. From our present discussion it may appear that the Romans are in error as well as the protestants, and that the religion given by God to the Jews is not to be changed; that Christ, as he himself said, did not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil it. He would have reformed it—he would have restored religion to its primitive purity and simplicity. But man did not understand him; and a more mighty superstition than that which he strove to correct, was attached by designing men to purity itself, and soon involved it in darkness.

change in the nature of man, and must continue to be so Were the doctrine just, there could be no repentance, because. repentance implies not that man is *dead* in sin, but capable of getting rid of it, which he could not do, unless his nature be now as it has always been, much better than the divines would have it to be.

We now come to the cream of the doctrine; the proofs, as they are called, of the proposition that our first parents and their posterity became, in consequence of the forbidden fruit having been eaten, "wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body."

Epistle to Titus i. 15.—"Unto the pure all things are pure, but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience are defiled." Against what is contained in this verse we have nothing to urge. As it contains simple and distinct propositions which we believe to be strictly true, we fully and entirely assent to it. To its application, as confirming the doctrine of defilement, we cannot assent.

"Unto the pure, all things are pure." Who are referred to here as the pure? They are the men whom the apostle referred to in another epistle, as having the law written in their hearts; to whom Christ referred as just persons who need no repentance; those of whom he said, "Blessed are the pure in heart." The words of Christ entitle us to affirm that such persons have existed, and do exist, however rare they may have been and still are. But if man be wholly and innately defiled and corrupt, their existence would be impossible. Therefore, this pretended Christian doctrine appears to us to contradict Christ and his apostles, who are more worthy of credit than divines, who, by their own confession, were wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body. That there are defiled and unbelieving persons is a truth, and to them nothing is pure; and it is equally true that their minds and consciences are defiled. It is undeniable, that, at this day, ninety-nine out of a hundred professing Christians are, in practice, heathens. But while beings of an opposite description are found, and their existence, even among the Gentiles, acknowledged by Christ and his apostles, we cannot admit the doctrine to be true, or calculated to serve any purpose, except that of degrading man in his own eyes, and rendering him careless of improvement, and of the will of God.

Genesis vi. 5.—"And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of his heart was only evil continually." This refers to a period long subse-

quent to the creation of man. Now, if the doctrine in question be true, God, from the first, knew that what is affirmed in the above text, would be the consequence of the first man and woman having eaten of the forbidden fruit. Therefore God could not have been angry at what He saw of the wickedness of man; nor have prepared to punish that which the doctrine assumes to have been itself a punishment inflicted by himself.

It appears to us a very strange idea, that God should first punish man by changing his nature, and then destroy him by a deluge, on account of the effects of that change. Hence we affirm, that the nature of man has not been changed since his creation; that his original nature made him prone to sin, that he did sin accordingly, and so has his posterity sinned, and will be punished, as heretofore punished, unless he sets himself to discover and obey the law of God.

Jeremiah xviii. 9.—"The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it?" This is Jeremiah's opinion, and he is not far wrong. Our inclinations are not always in the path of rectitude, if we may be permitted so to interpret the word heart. But what reference this opinion has to the effects of eating of the forbidden fruit we do not perceive. It is merely a general remark, occasioned by the low state of morality which seems to have obtained among the Jews at the time. The question is *not* are men wicked, but are they wicked in consequence of having eaten of the forbidden fruit?

Then follows the quotation from Paul's Epistle to the Romans, from the tenth to the eighteenth verse of chapter third, beginning, "As it is written, there is none righteous, no not one." These verses describe the degraded state of morals in St. Paul's time, and the description is correct. He makes no reference to the *cause* of that state, directly or indirectly. Such a cause as that assigned by the doctrine of corruption is too remarkable not to have been pointedly referred to, if it were true. It would not have been left to future divines to invent such a doctrine. Another sentence of St. Paul, the twenty-second verse of the fifteenth chapter of his First Epistle to the Corinthians, has been advanced in favour of the doctrine, "For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." As one interpretation is as good as another, as soon as it is admitted there is need of interpretation, the meaning of these words seems to be, that as Adam and all his posterity have sinned, and do not deserve salvation on account of their sins, and have died in their sins, so shall all those who listen to the preaching of Christ, and act as he has prescribed, forsaking the indulgence

of their senses, and inferior faculties, and permitting themselves to be guided by their moral powers, live as the children of God, and be admitted into His presence.

In reference to the effect of Christ's appearance on the condition of man as a defiled and corrupted being, the Confession of Faith thus mysteriously and dogmatically speaks: "The corruption of nature during this life doth remain in those that are regenerated: and although it be, through Christ, pardoned and mortified, yet both itself, and all the motions thereof, are truly and properly sin." Here we are told that the corruption of nature is *pardoned*. We would ask, how can a *state of being* be pardoned? Pardon implies an *act* requiring to be forgiven. It is said that corruption is sin, a proposition liable to a similar objection; because while sin implies an act, corruption is not an act. "The motions thereof," that is, evil desires, are doubtless sinful, when they lead us to act in a manner contrary to the dictates of moral sentiment; but there is no indication of the doctrine in the abuse of any of our faculties, which are all in themselves good when not abused. It would be foreign to our present purpose to enter into the consideration of the doctrine of regeneration. It is sufficient to have shown that the connection formed in the above quotation, between it and corruption, is utterly unintelligible.

It is needless to go further into the examination of the supposed proofs of this doctrine at present. We believe it to be very injurious to the best interests of man. Its tendency is to degrade him in his own eyes, and to retard his improvement and progress towards fitness for a future state of existence. It is in direct contradiction to the established laws of nature, if we believe man to have been created in conformity to the system in which he was placed. It is in contradiction to the attributes of God; and this we will now proceed to demonstrate, believing the arguments we are about to employ to be conclusive.

We are told that God created man, and placed him in a garden in which were planted two trees, of the fruit of one of which the man and his wife were forbidden to eat, under the penalty of death, which penalty is conceived by those who subscribe to the doctrine, to have been an entire change of nature. If the attributes of God be such as we assume them to be, He must have known that the prohibition would be neglected, and the penalty incurred. His omniscience and foreknowledge must have made him aware that such would be the event. God is an infinitely intelligent being, and infinitely just and merciful. But there is not only manifest injustice in giving a command, with the knowledge that it was to be disobeyed, and that una-

voidably; but absolute and wanton cruelty, in determining beforehand to punish the man and woman for having acted as they were destined to act, and who could not be free agents under the circumstances in which they were placed, by rendering them corrupt and unfit to fulfil the law of their maker. If God did not know that they would disobey the command, then the attribute of omniscience is incorrect. We must therefore choose whether to believe in the attributes ascribed to God, or in a doctrine which ascribes to Him actions inconsistent with them.

We are told that "the serpent was more subtile than any beast of the field which God had made." This implies that among other beasts God created serpents, and made it the most subtile of them. That serpents were created is true; but that they are more subtile than other creatures is not true. To get rid of this difficulty, it has been supposed, in defence of the doctrine, that the serpent here spoken of was the devil in disguise. Had this been meant by the writer of the history, it is probable he would have been more explicit. But we shall take the supposition, and consider whether it be consistent with the attributes of God.

It is admitted that God is the great first cause of ALL existence. It is admitted that the devil is a dependent being, over whom God can exercise power. It is impossible to conceive that he could admit any rival in intelligence or power, or suffer himself to be overreached, and his designs to be thwarted by such rival intelligence. It has been said by some, that in the present case, God permitted the rival power to act, so as to deceive the woman, and thus bring about her disobedience. If this be the case, the Creator cannot be a dignified and moral being, but one governed by selfish cunning and deceit.

If the devil be not a dependent being, but one opposed to the Creator; and if this same devil assumed the form of a serpent, with the design of counteracting God's plans; and if, in the present case, he did succeed, as is supposed, in rendering abortive the primitive intentions of the Creator in forming man, how is it possible that God can have the attributes of ubiquity, omniscience, or infinite intelligence? If God possessed those attributes, He must have been aware of the serpent's design, and have counteracted it. At any rate His benevolence and justice would have given the first pair warning to be on their guard. But the doctrine in question will not admit of this, and therefore impugns the attributes of God. It is quite evident, according to the history, that, but for the interference of the serpent, the first pair had no thought of disobeying the command they had received. But it is also evident they could not have

been perfect beings, because they were liable to be deceived. If, then, God permitted them to be deceived, and knew that they would be deceived, we must be very much mistaken indeed, in regard to His Moral Perfection. To say that it was God's intention to create a perfect being, knowing that he would almost immediately become corrupted in his nature, and that all his posterity were to act in opposition to His will in consequence of corruption, and so as to render it necessary that God should devise and execute a plan to satisfy scruples of his own, and to relieve man from the consequences of what He foresaw and might easily have prevented, is to exhibit the Creator as a weak and capricious being. Such is the effect of the doctrine of corruption.

Further; we are told that God, after man had multiplied on the earth, was dissatisfied with his conduct, that he destroyed the whole race, excepting one family. If God did not foresee that His own work was to become so bad as to provoke him to destroy it, this also reduces His attributes to a low level. But having destroyed His work, it is natural to suppose that He would have improved that small portion of it that remained, so as to be satisfied with it, and not have left it to return to the same state of imperfection a second time. But the doctrine of corruption will have us to believe that God destroyed mankind, all but one family, knowing that this could have no good effect, but would leave man in a state again to provoke him by wickedness, and to force Him, as divines speak, to devise a new plan to satisfy himself. The wickedness of man has been as great since the flood, and since the appearance of Christ, as it could ever by possibility have been before it, although God has not seen fit to punish mankind again in a summary manner. We thus find, on slight examination of the circumstances, that there is no foundation in scripture for the doctrine of corruption, whether we test it by moral considerations, or by matter of fact.

But we have yet a further assurance in Holy Writ, that the doctrine is false, because it is opposed to God's own word, the law He laid down for the government of His own people. It is utterly impossible that God could have rendered Adam's posterity liable to punishment for the sins of Adam, and yet free all parents from liability for the sins of their children, and all children from punishment on account of the sins of their parents. If God acknowledged this principle at any time He must have regarded it at all times. It is written in the book of Deuteronomy, xxiv. 16, "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children; neither shall the children be put to death for their fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin." This principle was clearly approved by God, when Abraham interceded for

Sodom and Gomorrha that the innocent should not be destroyed with the guilty. Nothing can be more explicit in reference to this principle than the contents of the 18th chapter of the prophet Ezekiel. In all these enactments God exhibited His justice; in the doctrine of Corruption there is none of it.

It ought, perhaps, to be a sufficient reason for rejecting the doctrine of corruption, that the Jews, who understand their own books better than we, repudiate this doctrine.

## Art. V.—FRAGMENTARY NOTICES OF CHINESE CIVILIZATION.*

"Is there any thing whereof it may be said, See, this is new? it hath been already of old time, which was before us."

* * * * * * * * * * *

If we view the human species, as a whole,—as one great complex individual, governed in all its parts and movements by a pervading and continuous organization,—and if we regard the different forms of civilization, through which it has passed, as the successive stages of its growth, each of which occurs in its proper season, and prepares the way for those which are to follow;—it is obvious, we cannot comprehend, in any enlarged sense, the history of mankind,—we cannot even understand the present condition of our race in the vast theatre of God's universal Providence—a position, into which we have been brought by a series of changes, woven together in indissoluble connection, from the commencement of the world,—without going back to the contemplation of those primitive forms of social life, into which humanity shaped itself, on first emerging from barbarism, and which sheltered and cherished its latent germs of intelligence and refinement, till capable of being transplanted to a more fruitful soil and genial sky. It is, therefore, a fortunate circumstance for the philosophical enquirer, that the manners and institutions of Asia, where civilization unquestionably had its source, should have been, through thousands of years, so fixed and permanent in their character, as almost to supply the place of historical records, by setting before our eyes at the present day, the very image of that form of society, which grew up with the infancy of our race and has prolonged its continuance.

Hence the recitals of modern travellers into the East convey to us as distinct an impression of what mankind once universally were, as the accounts of ancient writers, and serve by the minute details which they furnish, to complete the fragmentary notices which the latter have bequeathed to us. A great difference exists in this respect between Oriental antiqui-

* These notices are extracted from a MS. Course of Lectures on the Early History of Asiatic Civilization. Some apology is due for presenting them in this form to the public. The writer himself was unwilling to let them appear, till he had had an opportunity of reducing them to a more connected and finished state. But the editor was of opinion, that at the present time they might excite some interest, and exhibit in one view information respecting China that might not be so easily accessible to every reader from another source.—J. J. T.

ties and those of the Greeks and Romans. We possess, indeed, the precious literature of the last; but when we traverse the beautiful regions which they once occupied, we find no living vestige of the manners, religion and civil polity, which flourished under their institutions;—these have long vanished from the earth;—man's workmanship, but not man himself, survives, to tell us what they were: and the fractured altar, the mouldering temple, the broken aqueduct, the far-stretching highway faintly traced across the green-sward and the corn-fields of modern cultivation, and the vast circuit of the silent amphitheatre, alone present themselves to the eye of the observer, as the solitary witnesses of the wide diffusion of their ancient civilization. But it is far otherwise in the East. There even the ideas, the habitudes, and the pursuits of men, seem to partake of the immobility of the nature, which encircles them, and to repeat, generation after generation, the same unvarying cycle of childlike docility, and of unenquiring submission to authority.

* * * * * * * * * *

The term by which the Chinese designate their country, signifies *the centre of the world,*—an idea allied to that, which led the Indians to describe their sacred hill Meru, as the pistil of the lotus, under which they symbolized the universe. Sin or Tchin was the appellation given to China by the people of western Asia, and has evidently an affinity with the name Sinæ, which seems to have been applied in a vague way by the Romans to all the nations east of the Ganges.* The Chinese were first known, as a distinct nation, to the western world, in the period of the lower Roman empire. The Seres, who are earlier mentioned as the people† from whom silk was imported into Europe, and who are considered by the authors‡ of the Ancient Universal History, after Prideaux, as the Chinese,—appear to have dwelt considerably to the west of China proper. Arrian, who flourished in the age of the Antonines, A. D. 140, speaks of the Sinæ or Thinæ, who exported raw and manufactured silk through Bactria into the regions of the West.§ Klaproth,‖ who has studied the native records of the Chinese themselves, says, that they became acquainted with the Romans, through the medium of the Parthians, who occupied for several centuries the boundary between the Roman Empire and the rich coun-

* Malte Brun, Geogr. Univ. Liv. xlii. The Chinese: A General Description of China and its Inhabitants, by J. F. Davis, Esq. F.R.S. London, 1836.

† Their name occurs in Horace and Virgil. Silk was called from them, *Sericum.*

‡ Vol. v. fol. p. 300. n. B. Prideaux's Connection, vol. iii.

§ Davis.

‖ Tableaux Historiques de l'Asie, p. 68 seqq.

tries of the far East, and that everything great or wonderful out of their own territory the Chinese were in the habit of attributing to the Romans.

In A.D. 166, Marcus Antoninus dispatched an embassy to them, with commercial views, which landed in Tonquin; and the intercourse thus opened appears to have lasted for a considerable time, but was at last broken off by the jealousy of the Parthians, who were anxious to prevent all direct communication between the Chinese and the Romans. The Parthians received raw silk from China, which they manufactured themselves, before it was transmitted to the West; and the monopoly of this lucrative business they were naturally desirous not to lose. The Roman fleets engaged in this eastern trade set sail from the ports of Egypt or from the Persian Gulph. From this time, though at intervals of various length, the connexion of the western world with the Chinese seems never to have been entirely interrupted.

Between A.D. 859 and 880, China was visited by two Arabian merchants, whose itineraries have been translated and published by Renaudot. In the latter half of the thirteenth century, A.D. 1250—95, the Venetian traveller, Marco Polo, spent many years in the country, and having been invested by the reigning Emperor, Kublai Khan, with an office of some trust in the southern provinces, had an excellent opportunity of becoming acquainted with its singular institutions, and with the manners and occupations of its inhabitants. Rubruquis and our own countryman, Sir John Maundeville,* also visited China, before the East was laid generally open by navigation round the Cape of Good Hope. Since that time, travellers accompanying embassies, and above all the missionaries of the Christian religion, especially the Jesuits, have contributed to increase our knowledge of the Chinese. At one period the Jesuits seemed to have a fair prospect of effecting a permanent establishment in the country, had not the views of the more rational and moderate among them been frustrated by the fanatical indiscretion of their companions. They enjoyed favour and encouragement at court; and it is to them that we are indebted for the trigonometrical survey of the country, on which the present maps of China are founded. It appears, from an ancient monument, which was dug up more than a century ago, and is now generally admitted to be authentic, that the Nestorian Christians had made a settlement in China as early as the middle of the seventh century.† In Marco Polo's time, their worship was tolerated, and they had churches in the principal cities of the empire. Protestant missionaries

* A. D. 1349. † A. D. 640.

have carried on the researches begun by the Catholics. Every one who has attended to these subjects, is acquainted with the labours of the late Dr. Morrison, who bequeathed his valuable collection of Chinese books to the library of University College, London; and there is every reason to believe, that the language and literature of China will henceforth engage a larger share of the attention of Orientalists. The French *Savans* have led the way in this new path of learned enquiry. In the earlier part of the last century, Chinese were frequently sent into Europe by the Jesuits, to receive their education, that they might promote the objects of the mission on their return. It was from a Chinese, resident in Paris, that the learned Fréret, drew the materials of the instructive disquisitions which have been preserved in the Memoirs of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres. Two others, when they went back to their native country, were furnished by the learned men of France with a number of questions, the replies to which were the first occasion of the *Memoires concernant les Chinois*, which have since been extended to fourteen or fifteen quarto volumes. In the last volume of the series is a Chronological Abstract of Chinese History, drawn from native sources by Pere Gaubil.* Among recent scholars, Klaproth, Abel Remusat, and Silvestre de Sacy, may be mentioned as those who have largely contributed, by their labours, to throw light on the language and antiquities of the Chinese.

* * * * * * * * *

As in India, two different races seem to have successively inhabited China. Relics of the primitive barbarians still subsist under the name of Miao, unsubdued, and speaking a dialect of their own, in the western highlands, to which they have retreated before the progress of civilization. They are admitted to be a distinct race from the Chinese, and are probably allied to the Thibetians. Various suppositions have been entertained as to the origin of the Chinese. Sir W. Jones† regards them as a colony from India, whose national characteristics were gradually effaced by intermarrying with aborigines and the Tartars, and in this view Mr. Davis‡ participates. De Guignes traces them from Egypt; and De Pauw considers them as a tribe of Tartars or Scythians. Many considerations militate powerfully against the supposition of their connection with Hindostan or with

* Traité de la Chronologie Chinoise par le Pere Gaubil; publié par M. Silvestre de Sacy. Paris, 1814. The original manuscript was sent from Pekin to Fréret in 1794.

† Discourses before the Asiatic Society.

‡ Memoirs concerning the Chinese. Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. i. Part I.

Egypt. Though the Indians and the Chinese both employ a cycle of sixty years in their chronology, yet with the former it is a cycle of Jupiter, with the latter a solar cycle. Though both divide the moon's path through the heavens, into twenty eight mansions, yet the principle of division adopted by the two nations is perfectly distinct, and cannot therefore have been borrowed by one from the other.* Had the Chinese been a colony from Egypt, they must have landed at the south of the country, but to this supposition all their earliest traditions are strongly opposed. The most probable view is that espoused by Klaproth,† that the Chinese took possession of their present seats from the north west, descending into them from the mountainous district, which was anciently called *Kuenlun*, near the lake Koko Nor. Here was their holy hill, and the scene of their ancient mythology; the West being the sacred region to them, as the North to the Hindoos. The first historical notices of China prove its civilization to have commenced in the northern provinces.

* * * * * * * * *

Confucius was born 549 B.C., of the imperial family of Tchingtang under the dynasty of the Tcheon. After having filled a great number of public situations, and employed himself in writing history, and in arranging and illustrating the ancient books called *king*, he died in his native province of Lou, 479 B.C. His precepts and aphorisms were collected after his death by his disciples. His morality is mild, pure, and rational, and is intimately connected, in his instructions, with the science of politics. It is based on the principle of the supreme importance of submission to legitimate authority. He repeats again and again, if we may trust the extracts which the Jesuits have given from his works, that the happiness of a community must arise from the diffusion through every part of it, of a spirit of subjection and obedience. Through all the gradations of private life up to the general dependence of subjects on their sovereign, he would have the doctrine of paternal authority carried out to its utmost extent; and in his system, a king should be the father of his people, and the administration of a family furnish the type of the government of a kingdom. Order, subordination to established authority, gravity of manners, and personal self-discipline are the bases on which the great Chinese legislator sought to build the civilization of his country. In his *Ta-hio*, or book of great science, the materials of which he collected from more ancient documents, he treats, 1. of self-renewal; 2. of the

* Davis. † Tableaux Historiques de l'Asie.

renewal of the people by example; 3. of constancy in the supreme good. He reckons as the three distinguishing qualities of a perfect prince—obedience to parents; respect to elder brothers; kindness to inferiors. In the same work, he lays down five universal rules of action; mutual justice between a king and his subjects; love between parents and children; fidelity between husbands and wives; mutual offices of kindness and affection between friends. He taught that rectitude and purity of heart were the foundations of all morality; and recommended the golden mean in the following quaint terms, as they are conveyed by the Latin of his translators,—"Avoid defect and excess, and you will apprehend the mean; the reputedly wise miss it by excess; the ignorant, by coming short of it." These doctrines were delivered by Confucius after the ancient fashion, in conversation with his disciples. He was a strenuous upholder of the doctrines and precepts handed down from the sages of an earlier day, and opposed to all innovation. His maxim was, "I believe in, and I love antiquity." The authorities to which he constantly appealed in the course of his instruction, were the odes and metrical proverbs of the ancient kings and sages, and the examples of virtue contained in the chronicles of former days. These furnished the texts, with which he enforced his teachings. He was accustomed to say, that the substance of these ancient poems, the vehicles of traditional wisdom, was contained in this one phrase; "Let the thoughts of our minds be free from all wickedness." Confucius was simple in his manners, and plain in his dress and food. Among the particulars recorded of him it is said, that, in common with many other legislators of antiquity, he ascribed great importance to music in civilizing mankind. It has been observed of the Mandarins or learned sect in China, who are followers of Confucius, that they teach nothing respecting the immortality of the soul.* It appears, however, according to some interpreters, to have been the doctrine of Confucius, that the constant habit of virtue so strengthens the soul as to endue it finally with the attribute of immortality.†

* * * * * * * * *

Education in China has been for ages completely in the hands of the state. The doctrines of the *king* or ancient books, as expounded by Confucius, constitute the basis of public instruction; and the inculcation of these doctrines is entrusted to the literary class or Mandarins. There is a regular gradation of schools and colleges, from the most elementary institutions of the provincial

* Davis, ch. XII. † Œuvres de Fréret. Histoire. Tom. VI. p. 283.

towns to the central boards of the capital, which are open in due succession to all of every class who choose to enter them. Advancement is awarded to merit alone. Every three years an examination of the different orders of the learned takes place, to ascertain their fitness for office; when only those that are proved competent are re-appointed. This learned class is replenished by merit only from all ranks in the state. Its members fill all the public offices, and execute all the functions of the government. They have the compiling of the national annals; preside at the astronomical board, which fixes the calendar and the religious ceremonies of the nation; and on the days of the full and new moon they instruct the people in morality, and make them acquainted with the laws, out of sixteen discourses, a sort of prescribed homilies, appointed to be read by authority, and founded on their ancient writings. The Emperor is regarded as the father and absolute master of the state, who executes his will through the Mandarins. The princes of the blood enjoy no official power and dignity. Nevertheless, an authority is recognised above that of the Emperor, that of the *king* or sacred books. This authority is embodied and expressed in the order of the Mandarins, as that of the Vedas is invested in the Brahmins. In the Mandarins therefore the real power of the empire resides. They form its aristocracy. Drafted however impartially from all ranks in the state, owing their advancement to merit alone, and subjected to periodical tests of competency, forming no exclusive caste, and enjoying no distinctions or privileges to which the humblest member of the community may not equally aspire,—they connect this aristocracy of talent and knowledge, upon whose undisputed influence the tranquillity of the state depends, through endless ramifications with the great body of the people, and thus give breadth and solidity to the basis of the national civilization.

Hence there are no parties, no factions; jarring and friction no where occur; but every thing proceeds with the regularity of a well-adjusted machine. The mass of the nation are intensely interested in preserving things as they are. Turbulence and innovation are hateful to the Chinese. They may wish a change of dynasty, but such an event would leave the general character of their civilization unaltered. These are the causes which have secured for ages the permanence and immobility of the Chinese institutions. The Mongols formerly, as the Mandchows now, have governed China; but under these as well as under native dynasties, the working of society and the manners of the nation have continued perfectly Chinese. The deep-rooted power of the Mandarins is proved by the inability of the most

despotic princes to set it aside. The tyrant Tsin-chi-hoang struck a deadly blow at the order by commanding the destruction of their classical books; and more effectually to break the spirit of the learned, he barbarously compelled numbers of them to exchange the pen for the trowel, and assist in erecting the great wall. Yet they rose again from the stroke that would have levelled them, and in a few years we find the institutions connected with them in greater strength and vigour than ever. It was probably a feeling of the same kind which led the sagacious Kublai Khan, at a much later period, to encourage the settlement of Christians in his newly acquired empire, as a counterpoise to the power of this native aristocracy.

* * * * * * * * *

We have reason to congratulate ourselves, that in the midst of that long lapse of ages, during which the very name of China was almost lost to the western world, and while Europe was still groaning under the weight of the feudal system, with a commerce confined to a few favoured spots, and with arts and literature only just awakening into life,—a Venetian traveller should have penetrated into this vast and flourishing empire, and been admitted without suspicion or difficulty into the very heart of its public and private life—of its manners, its institutions, and its form of government. Marco Polo visited this singular country at an eventful and interesting period; in the latter half of the thirteenth century, just after its first entire subjugation to foreign rule by the Mongol conqueror, Kublai Khan, the grandson of the celebrated Genghiz Khan. At the court of this prince he was received with marks of extraordinary favour, and was employed by him on several missions of importance in the central and southern parts of his dominions. The Venetian had thus an opportunity of surveying at leisure the form into which Chinese civilization had been gradually consolidated through the centuries that had passed since its first foundations were laid.

When we consider the tenacity with which the Chinese have always adhered to their traditional usages and institutions, and that, at this day, their system of morals and policy and the whole of their public instruction are based on the doctrines of Confucius, who is universally admitted to have flourished five or six centuries before Christ,—I do not see how we can object to the conclusion, that the picture exhibited to us in the pages of Marco Polo may be regarded as a faithful exposition of the inherent principles of the ancient Chinese civilization, worked out to their natural results, and developed in their fullest expansion. He had many of the qualifications which we most desire

in a traveller; and his account is just such as we should wish to read of such a people—shrewd, desultory, unstudied and circumstantial. Carried into these remote regions by the spirit of commercial enterprise, and unbiassed by any preconceived theories to warp his conclusions, he has simply recorded what he saw, and stated his impressions as they occurred to him. His narration, taken down, it is said, from his lips by the pen of a friend, has all the freshness of a direct transcript from the memory, and combines in no small degree with the sagacity and practised observation of the man of the world, the picturesque touches and delightful garrulity of Herodotus.

In Marco Polo's time, northern and southern China were distinguished respectively by the names of Kathay and Manji; and in making use of his book for illustrations of Chinese civilization, we must observe, to which of these portions of the empire, the facts which he furnishes relate.

It was in the South that the purely Chinese constitution of society was to be most distinctly seen. The North was then under the direct and powerful influence of the Mongol or Tartar invaders, in all the pride and vigour of recent conquest, and not yet assimilated to the manners of their more civilized subjects. The period of Marco Polo's visit to China gives, however, increased interest to his work, as it sets before us in vivid contrast the characters of the Tartars and the Chinese, who from time immemorial have been engaged in the conflict which is natural to a wandering and a settled population, living in each others' immediate vicinity, and are yet, after all, branches perhaps of one primitive stock, descending originally from the Altaian chain, and exhibit only the difference of the same race, long habituated to civilization, or just emerging from barbarism.

There is no evidence, that even in northern China the Mongols made any great alteration in existing institutions; they seem rather to have left the political and social organization as they found it. The Venetian's descriptions harmonise for the most part with the accounts of native historians. The order of administration and the ceremonial of the court appear to have been the same. At the commencement of the year, the subjects of the Khan came and offered him their gifts, and his name, inscribed on a tablet and held up to public gaze by the chief priest, was adored with profound reverence by the assembled levee. The empire was divided into thirty-two provinces, conformably to the arrangement which had been introduced in the reign of Tsin-chi-hoang. The business of the government was divided into two principal departments, the military and the civil, each conducted by a council of twelve nobles. Of these

councils or boards, the civil appointed the governors of the provinces, subject to the approval of the Khan himself. In Kanbalu, now Peking, the capital of northern China, the civil board had a large and handsome suite of offices, where the business of each province was transacted in a separate bureau. On their departure for their provinces, the governors received from the Khan a gold or silver tablet, according to their rank. The military board, in the time of Marco Polo, constituted the highest tribunal in the state. Here the tablets of honour were distributed to the officers of the army, proportionate to the extent of command with which they were invested. These tablets of honour, both civil and military, have considerable resemblance to the orders, with which the sovereigns of Europe still decorate the individuals whom they wish to distinguish.

The regularity and rigid spirit of subordination conspicuous in these proceedings, with the direct dependance of all the details of administration, even in the remotest provinces, on the central government, are impressed with the strongest marks of Chinese civilization. The same character of order and exactness distinguishes the arrangements for keeping open a ready communication with the capital. Stretching out in every direction there were high roads planted on each side with trees, and kept in repair by officers appointed for that purpose by government. At certain intervals were posts, with relays of horses and accommodation for travellers. These establishments were maintained with an immediate reference to the purposes of government, but they must also have greatly facilitated the internal commerce of the country. Foot messengers with belts attached to their girdles, were stationed every three miles on these great roads, for the conveyance to and fro of letters and dispatches. The government messengers were also authorized to exact the use of horses and boats from the people of the district, who were entitled in consequence to a proportionate remission from their annual payment of taxes. On occasions of great emergency, expresses were employed, who carried with them the tablet of the ger-falcon, in token of the special authority they were empowered to exercise. All such arrangements are convincing proofs of a long-established and well-organized civilization.

Some usages are mentioned by Marco Polo, which must clearly be considered as belonging rather to Tartar than to Chinese manners;—I allude to the inordinate devotion of the Khan and his nobles to the pleasures of the chase,—a taste, in which the Venetian merchant appears to have enthusiastically participated. This passion is characteristic of tribes, who have reached a similar grade of social advancement with the Mon-

gols at the period now referred to, standing on the verge of a settled civilization, and yet clinging with fondness to the pursuits of a more free and independent course of life. We have abundant examples of the same taste in the Normans, who brought under their sway the effeminate inhabitants of France and England, as the Mongols subjugated the Chinese; and it is not less curious and instructive to remark, that, in regions the most remote, the same causes are followed by the same effects. Among the Tartarian, as among the Scandinavian, warriors, the privileges of the chase were regarded as the sign of birth and the token of ascendancy; and the game laws of our own feudal times we meet with again, scarcely altered in any essential particular, in northern China. No tradesman, mechanic, or husbandman, was allowed to keep any sporting dog or bird. No nobleman was permitted to hunt or hawk within a certain distance of the imperial residence, unless he had obtained a license, by having his name inscribed on the list of the grand falconer, or enjoyed from the Khan a special privilege to that effect. The master of the chase was an important officer in the royal household; and during the great hunting expeditions which occurred every year, the whole court migrated from the capital, and spent many weeks in the wilds of Tartary.

As I am speaking of the Tartars, I will briefly mention one or two other peculiarities in their manners. They brought with them from their nomade state a great fondness for the horse, almost resembling that of the Hindoos for the cow. Kublai Khan had a stud of ten thousand horses and mares, white as snow, whose milk was set apart for the exclusive use of the descendants of Genghiz Khan. With this milk the Emperor made an oblation on certain days to the deities of his nation. The Tartar prince was also fond of artificial gardening, and no small similarity may be discerned between his taste in this respect, and that of some of the powerful monarchs who anciently swayed the wide plains of Mesopotamia. In the neighbourhood of Peking, the Khan had a country residence, where he raised an artificial hill, called the Green Mount, which he planted with all kinds of trees, dug up with their roots, and brought on the backs of elephants from a distance. Another peculiarity was the religious veneration of all the princes of the race of Genghiz Khan for the Altaian mountains. Here they were buried, however distant the spot where they might chance to die: and all the individuals who were met on the road, in the course of the funeral procession, were sacrificed to the shades of the departed, under the idea that they would become

his servants in the future world. This reverential feeling for certain mountains, entertained by many early nations, indicates a deep traditional persuasion, that the first wanderings of their tribe commenced from those elevated spots, and that *there* was the primitive home of their fathers.

* * * * * * * * *

Marco Polo describes the South of China, notwithstanding it had been more recently civilized than the North, as far more wealthy and luxurious, owing probably to its greater remoteness from the incursions of the Tartars and Turks. In his journey through the interior of the empire, in the regions watered by the great rivers, and then drained and cultivated, he was overwhelmed by the evidence of riches and populousness, which met him on every side;—the roads thronged with the transit of merchandize; handsome bridges of many arches crossing the numerous streams, roofed over from end to end, their sides lined with shops, and at their extremities a toll collected for the Emperor; and many large and walled towns maintained in prosperity by the activity of their commerce. In Kanbalu itself there were extensive manufactories of silks and gold tissues: jewels, pearls, drugs and spices were imported into it from India; and Marco Polo affirms, that a thousand carriages and pack-horses laden with raw silk entered the capital daily.

Two circumstances are mentioned by this traveller, and confirmed by statements in the native annalists,* which deserve notice, as furnishing a parallelism to corresponding usages in Europe,—the establishment of a legal provision for the poor, and the introduction of a paper currency.—Food and clothing were distributed to the necessitous, by officers presiding over that part of the administration. The means of affording this extensive relief was provided in the following manner: The Emperor was entitled to a tenth of the produce of wool, silk, and hemp. These materials were worked up into different kinds of cloth, in houses set apart for the purpose, by artisans, who were obliged to give one day's work in the week to the Emperor. The supply of clothing thus obtained might be considered as raised by a rate on the industry of the community. In like manner the Emperor had large granaries always filled with corn. It is not indeed expressly stated by Marco Polo, that these supplies were procured by tything the produce of the soil. But the analogy of a similar state of society in ancient India, ren-

* Marco Polo's Travels, Marsden's Transl. B. ii. Memoires concernant les Chinois, tome derniere. Traité de la Chron. Chin., par le Pere Gaubil, publié par M. Silvestre de Sacy. In the Chronological Table inserted by the Jesuits in the third book of the *Scientia Sinica*, the antiquity of a legal provision for the poor is implied, by its being referred to the reign of the mythical legislator *Yao*.

ders it exceedingly probable, that the Emperor did exercise such a right. And at the present day, as we are informed by Mr. Davis, the Emperor is undoubtedly regarded as the ultimate owner of all the land in China, from which he receives a tax of ten per cent.* It is most probable, therefore, that a large amount of food and clothing was placed at the Emperor's disposal by a tax in kind, on the labour and produce of the community, and then dispensed in bounty, according to the necessities of the times. Our traveller says, that twenty thousand vessels of rice, millet, and panicum, were daily distributed to the poor in Kanbalu by the imperial officers. We will not press his words to the strict letter, but it is quite obvious, that there must have been a very extensive administration of relief, systematically conducted. We can hardly suppose such a practice to have been introduced for the first time by the Mongol conquerors. The necessity for its exercise to such an extent must have resulted from the natural consequences of a highly developed state of material civilization existing for centuries. The practice was not confined to the capital; it was adopted also in the other great towns of the empire; and its general introduction can only be viewed as one of the applications of the governing policy of China, to prevent tumult and discontent, by securing, as far as possible, to all classes an unfailing supply of the necessaries of life.

The issue of paper money is considered by Mr. Marsden, the translator of M. Polo, as an artful expedient on the part of Kublai Khan, to draw all the gold and silver out of circulation into his own exchequer. In the Asiatic monarchies, the state, represented by the sovereign, interferes with every thing. The king is to this day, in many parts of the East, the principal merchant in his dominions. In China the Emperor possessed a right of pre-emption, in the case of all articles brought to his capital by caravans of foreign merchants. The particular articles on which he fixed his choice were then appraised by a board of twelve individuals, and paid for in the paper currency; which the foreigners must of course lay out again in the purchase of commodities suited to their own country. It is conjectured by Mr. Marsden, that the articles thus obtained by the Emperor, being the best and choicest that had been brought to market, were afterwards disposed of by him in exchange for gold and silver. It is not probable, however, that the Mongols first introduced this paper currency; for Marco Polo found the use of it diffused through all parts of the Empire. A similar expe-

* The Chinese, i. p. 179—80.

dient for economising the use of the precious metals had been resorted to by the Carthaginians, and some of the Greek commercial states, at a very early period; and in China, Klaproth* traces back the origin of it to 119 B.C. But to the Venetian merchant the device appeared so novel and wonderful, and to give such an unbounded command of wealth, that he thought his master had really discovered the philosopher's stone. This money was issued at Kanbalu, made of the inner bark of the mulberry tree, and stamped with the imperial seal. To counterfeit it was a capital offence. When worn out it might be exchanged at the mint on a payment of three per cent.; or when gold or silver were wanted for the purposes of manufacture, they might be obtained in return for it.

Marco Polo's pursuits and habits of mind did not lead him to attend particularly to matters of religion and philosophy. The Mongols were adherents of the religion of Foh, or Buddhism; and it is probable, at the period of their recent invasion, the priests of that religion enjoyed considerable influence, particularly in the North of China. Nevertheless, there are several passages in his book which appear to include a reference to the literary sect, or disciples of Confucius. All who occupied themselves with science or philosophy, he classed under the general title of astrologers; but by these he evidently means the class that had charge of the public instruction. He says, for example, that in Kanbalu five thousand astrologers of various kinds were supported by the imperial bounty; and still more distinctly, that in Kinsai, the capital of southern China, there were particular streets, in which were "the dwellings of the astrologers and physicians, who also gave instructions in reading and writing, as well as in many other arts."

* * * * * * * * *

The most complete picture of the proper Chinese civilization,—of the effects produced on manners and commerce and social economy, by the full development of its peculiar institutions, undisturbed by foreign influences, is seen in Marco Polo's very minute description of the city of Kinsai. Kinsai is the modern Nantcheou, situated at some distance from the sea, with which it is connected by a navigable river. As our Venetian was provincial governor for three years of a district only one day's journey from Kinsai, he had abundant opportunities of becoming acquainted with that city.—It is curious to observe, how great works for draining the low lands in the neighbourhood of large rivers are constantly mentioned among the earliest efforts of

* Essay on the Origin of Paper Money.

civilization, and how the greatest development of commercial industry has often been found in such vicinities. Babylonia, the valley of the Nile, and, in modern times, Holland, may be referred to, as obvious examples. In the neighbourhood of Kinsai was a great fosse, forty miles in length, to receive the overflowings of the river, on the banks of which it was built, executed, it was said, by the ancient kings of the country. All the internal arrangements of this city appear to have been framed with a direct view to the preservation of the general tranquillity, and the encouragement of a ceaseless industry. A jealous police watched over the whole economy of society, and kept all its movements within the strictly defined limits of the established institutions. Like the towns in Holland, Kinsai was traversed in all directions by innumerable canals, leaving a space for carriages and foot-passengers on each side, and carrying off the refuse of the city into an adjoining lake. A spacious quay, bordering the banks of the canal, stretched along the front of the main street, in which were erected lofty warehouses of stone, for the accommodation of merchants from foreign parts. In the case of disputes between the natives and foreigners, proper officers were appointed to adjust them. A similar institution existed among the ancient Indians.* In some respects these officers resembled our modern consuls, or rather perhaps the *Proxeni* of the Greek states: and the existence of them implies a widely-diffused and a long-established commerce.

The harbour of Kinsai, twenty-five miles below the city itself, was thronged with ships from Cathay, or northern China, and India. With the latter country a very great trade was carried on. Spices were a principal article of import. The Coromandel coast was called by the Arabs the Pepper coast, from the abundance in which it furnished that produce. Of this article more than two thousand tons, in the time of Marco Polo, were annually landed on the quays of Kinsai.†

At the present day there are no traces of caste in China: all such distinctions have long been levelled by the despotic ascendancy of the state-worship and instruction. But as late as the latter half of the thirteenth century, to which period our present observations immediately refer, relics of their former existence might still be traced in southern China. In Kinsai, twelve of the handicraft trades were considered superior to the rest.

* Diodorus Siculus, ii. 42. His authority is Megasthenes.

† Travels, B. ii. Mr. Marsden shows, in his note, that this amount exceeds the annual importation of the same article into the port of London, taking the average of the years from 1778 to 1800; and concludes, therefore, that the whole of China must have been supplied from Kinsai.

As every thing was fixed by rule in China, for each of these trades a thousand workshops were provided, and in each shop from ten to forty hands were employed under a master, who did not himself work, but merely exercised a general superintendence, and assumed the airs of a gentleman. The ancient laws of the country required every citizen to follow the calling of his father; but permitted him, when he became rich, to discontinue the manual labour, provided he kept up the establishment, and employed persons to work at his paternal trade. There is some resemblance between these incorporated trades under their respective heads, and the Indian guilds, which are described in the Institutes of Menu. We probably see in them the relic of some old sacerdotal constitution, which was relaxed in favour of the tradesmen, when the influence of the priesthood was absorbed in a purely civil jurisdiction. Marco Polo has given us a very particular account of the revenues drawn by the Emperor from the district of Kinsai. They arose from duties on various articles; on salt, which was furnished in great quantities by the district, and on sugar and arrack; from the customs; from a tax on the twelve companies of artisans, perhaps the price they paid for the possession of their corporate privileges and rights; and, lastly, from a tithe of cattle, vegetable produce, and silk. Marco Polo calculates the whole annual return to have amounted to more than 20,000,000 ducats.

The police of Kinsai was strict, and organized with the greatest regularity. Stone buildings were erected for the reception of goods in case of fire; the mention of which circumstance indirectly proves, that the ordinary edifices were constructed of slighter materials. Watchmen patrolled the streets, struck the hours on a gong, assisted in extinguishing fire, and, on the occurrence of any tumult or insurrection, were called in to act with the military, as a sort of *gens d'armerie*. At intervals of a mile all over the district, sounding boards were erected on elevated mounds, to act as telegraphs, for the speedy communication of intelligence, and for summoning all the police to bear on a particular point. Persons found lame and sick in the streets were conveyed by these same watchmen to the hospitals, that had been founded and endowed by the ancient sovereigns of the country; and when cured they were obliged to employ themselves in some trade. A similar humane method of providing for the proper treatment of sick and friendless strangers is mentioned by Diodorus Siculus,* on the authority of Megasthenes, as prevailing in the north of India.

* Bibl. Hist. ii. 42.

At Kinsai, every householder was obliged to affix to the door of his dwelling the names of all its inmates, and the number of horses kept. The keepers of inns and hotels were required to enter in a book the names of all who had taken up their quarters with them, specifying the day and hour of their arrival and departure; and a copy of this record was daily transmitted to the police magistrates. With so much wealth, the means of physical enjoyment abounded in the capital of southern China, and the manners of its inhabitants were unwarlike and voluptuous. The islands of an adjoining lake were studded with pleasure-houses, and its waters, on summer afternoons, covered with a multitude of gaily-painted barges. The main street in Kinsai was paved with stones and brick on both sides, and its centre filled with fine gravel, from which the water was artificially drained off. Along this centre the carriages of the rich were continually passing to and fro. Marco Polo has described these vehicles. They were calculated to hold six persons, were covered over at top like an English tilted cart, and furnished with curtains and cushions.*

In tracing the history of civilization, nothing is more interesting than to mark the perpetual recurrence of the universal principles of human nature, under an endless variety of outward forms. Among all nations the employment of some other mode of conveyance than that which nature has furnished in our own legs and feet, seems to have been very early regarded as a mark of rank, and not unfrequently to have given occasion to the title of a particular class. The use of a horse constituted a social distinction, with a corresponding appellation, among the Greeks and Romans, and in the feudal states of modern Europe. Among some tribes of Arabs to go on foot was accounted scandalous, so that when any person of respectability died, his camel was tied to his grave, and there starved to death, that it might rise with him from the dead, and enable him to appear like a gentleman in the other world. At the present day it is the token of gentility in European society to keep a carriage; and the case was apparently the same in China some five or six hundred years ago. In ancient India the circumstances of the country gave a different turn to the same passion. There an elephant was the great object of ambition. It was deemed the proper vehicle for kings;† and Arrian‡ tells us, that there was

* Herodotus has described similar vehicles as used by the ladies of ancient Babylon: ἐπὶ ζευγέων ἐν καμάρῃσι ἐλάσασαι. i. 199.

† Βασιλικὸν ὄχημα, Arrian, Hist. Ind. c. 17.

‡ *Ibid.* The gradations of rank in India noticed by Arrian in this passage indicate a very luxurious state of society. The next distinction to that of keeping an elephant

no sacrifice the ladies of that country would not make to obtain the distinction of possessing one. Some points of resemblance present themselves between the manners of the ancient Indians and those of the Chinese, resulting, no doubt, from a similar state of civilization,—which may be here briefly noticed. The Chinese are fond of gay and decorated garments, rich brocades, and embroidered silk, adorned with pearls and precious stones. Strabo and Arrian, both following the same authorities, give a similar account of the Indians, particularly the women, and speak of their gold ornaments, their jewels, their ivory earrings, and their delicately textured robes of bright and various hues.* Arrian mentions a whimsical fashion of the Indians something similar to which was in vogue in our own country during the reigns of Elizabeth and James, that of staining their beards of different colours. The Chinese are careful not to expose themselves to the rays of the sun, and ward them off by large parasols and umbrellas. The same expedient for the same purpose is described by Strabo in his account of the Indians. Indeed the parasol held by one servant, or the canopy by two, over the head of an individual, was anciently regarded as a sign of rank, and as such is represented in the bas reliefs still subsisting among the ruins of Persepolis. Strabo further mentions, as a peculiarity of the Indians, that they have no social meals, but sup and dine just when it pleases them. Barrow, in his travels, alludes to the same unamiable practice among the Chinese, and describes an individual retiring to a corner, to enjoy his bowl of soup in solitary selfishness.

* * * * * * * * *

Chinese civilization exhibits the realization of a system of gross utilitarianism. Everything is measured in China by its tendency to promote the material well-being of mankind. That precious truth, upon which all that is most excellent and glorious in humanity depends, and which Christianity has first unfolded in all the power and magnitude of its endless applications, that the outward and corporeal life of man is but a discipline—an instrumental process—for developing in all classes of the community, the rich and exhaustless treasures of a moral and spiritual life;—that truth seems unknown to the Chinese: and without its influence, what is there in the most perfectly well-ordered society, and in the amplest supply of physical comforts and luxuries, to create true refinement of manners, genuine kindness

was driving four horses, *τὰ τέθριππα*; the third was employing camels; but to use only a single horse was considered quite disreputable, *ἄτιμον*.

* Strabo, xv. p. 1008, Oxf. edit. *χρυσοφοροῦσι καὶ διαλίθῳ κόσμῳ χρῶνται, σινδόνας τε φοροῦσιν εὐανθεῖς, καὶ σκιάδια αὐτοῖς ἕπεται.*

and nobleness of heart, or comprehensive vigour of understanding? These qualities do not belong to the Chinese as a people, and the reason is obvious. They do not cultivate the material, as a condition, in the present life, of the existence of the spiritual, element of civilization; but, in their system of education, morals, worship, and government, they just allow sufficient scope to the operation of the spiritual, to give its utmost development to the material, element. The value of the mind is estimated by its capacity to serve the body. That this is the character and object of all their institutions is frankly admitted by the two Chinese, who had been educated in Paris, in a curious memoir,* preserved in the voluminous collection of the Jesuits. The admirers of political centralization will find their principles worked out to perfection in the organisation of Chinese society. The individual has no existence and no activity, apart from the sphere assigned, and the impulse given, to him by the state. His will, as a moral agent, is resolved into that of the state. Of course, there are limits beyond which human nature, even in China, will not permit itself to be wronged; and we learn from Mr. Davis, that, at the present day, when abuses have proceeded to a great pitch, public meetings are sometimes held, by advertisement, for the purpose of remonstrating with unjust or obnoxious magistrates. Yet even in this case, what calls forth the demonstration of public spirit is not the impulse of improvement and reform, but annoyance at any deviation from established usage. The civil code of the Chinese is said to be distinguished for its simplicity, clearness, and brevity; the people are made acquainted with its provisions in the discourses periodically addressed to them by the magistrates; and a summary of the penal law is printed in a cheap form for general distribution.†

But these regulations, excellent in themselves, only give increased effect to the despotic spirit of the code itself. It fixes and orders and meddles with everything, penetrates even into the sanctuary of the human bosom, and subjects to its control those higher relations and responsibilities of humanity, which ought to be resigned entirely to the invisible sanctions of conscience. Chinese civilization is based on the universal application of the principle of paternal authority, ascending from the primary elements of domestic relationship, through all the

* Memoires concernant les Chinois, vol. i. p. 10, 11. See an instructive passage quoted by Schlosser (Univer. Hist. p. 94, vol. i.), which concludes with the following words; "Le savoir et le talent ne sont que des mots pour notre ministère, quan l'état n'en retire aucune utilité réelle."

† Davis, The Chinese, ch. vi.

intermediate grades of social dependence, up to that general obedience which is due from all to the supreme head of the state. Thus the most purely human and natural of all our duties, those duties which a parent owes to his child, and which only the inward spirit of religion and moral feeling can enable him to discharge with efficiency, are classed by the artificial institutions of China with the prescribed functions of a citizen, and parents are actually rewarded or punished by the state for the conduct of their children.

Extraordinary merit is due to Confucius, as the civilizer of a semi-barbarous race. Nevertheless, it may be conjectured, that the peculiar deficiencies, which we have noticed in the institutions of the Chinese, and which appear the more striking, when we compare their institutions with those of Europe, may have arisen from the fact of the legislation of Confucius being too powerful, as it were, for his age, and of his having aimed prematurely to realize a merely relative perfection of manners and society. He has permanently embodied his own conceptions of the true purpose of society in the institutions and through them in the national character of the Chinese, but having by his commanding genius, and the deep sagacity of his arrangements, arrested and fixed the form of society at a particular period of its growth, he has made no provision for a principle of internal development and indefinite progression. We learn from an ancient Chinese work, ascribed to Meng-tsee, or, as the name is latinized by the Jesuits, Mencius,* who was a follower of Confucius and flourished about a hundred years later than his master, that the early state of society in China corresponded very nearly to that which existed in Europe under the feudal system. Five ranks or orders were recognized in the state, mutually dependent, subordinate the one to the other, and with authority and jurisdiction corresponding. Grants of land were made by the crown to the great officers of state, resembling the feifs and benefices of the middle ages. It is curious to remark that the organic movements of society, in the process of formation, should, in ages and countries so remote, have been distinguished by features so nearly similar. Out of this state of things in Europe, a number of corporate interests have evolved themselves, municipal, ecclesiastic, and legislative, which, wherever they have been able to retain their vitality, have presented a check to the all-absorbing centralization of the crown, and, whatever may have been their collateral evils and frequent abuses, and however much they may need the hand of

* Referred to by Davis, vol. i. p. 179, 180.

reform with the progress of time, must be admitted by all who have candidly traced the course of European History, even amidst the conflicts of party and selfishness, to have kept alive a sense of human rights, and nursed a spirit of energetic and manly freedom. From causes which it is now perhaps impossible to detect, such a development of independent interests never took place in China. The principle of paternal authority triumphed over every other influence. The institutions of Confucius, universally established, and carried systematically into practice, reduced the whole mass of citizens to one uniform level, and admitted no moving force into any part of the social system, but that which emanated from its recognised head. The Emperor of China, who is worshipped with religious honours, and considered as the supreme proprietor of all the lands in his dominions, may strictly apply to himself the words which Louis the Fourteenth, even in Old France, could not with perfect truth appropriate,—*L'Etat c'est moi.* It should make no material difference in our estimate of the ultimately debasing influences of this form of society, that the people themselves furnish the aristocracy by whose instrumentality it is maintained, and cheerfully bind on themselves the trammels in which they live. China is in fact a great workshop of material industry, in which the Emperor represents the master, and all the subordinate functionaries of the state are the salaried overlookers and superintendents.

* * * * * * * * *

There can be little doubt, that the peculiar character of the Chinese written language has hindered the free development of the national mind. It is hardly necessary to remark, that the written character of the Chinese does not, like the alphabetical represent the sounds of the human voice, but the immediate expression of ideas by correspondent symbols. Some fatality, like that which has attended all the institutions of the Chinese, seems to have arrested their system of visible signs at this particular stage. When the old knotted cords which are alluded to in their ancient chronicles, were abandoned, the Chinese proceeded, in the first instance, like all other nations, to draw the image of the idea they wished to convey. These pictures were gradually altered and abbreviated, and at last became merely arbitrary symbols. The numbers of these had increased to such an extent, and created so much confusion, that in the reign of Tsin-chi-hoang, his minister Lisse reduced them all to one form, which was universally established by royal authority. The Chinese system of written signs is admitted by all who have studied it, to be the product of reflection

and metaphysical analysis.* The radical signs represent generic ideas, of which the particular modifications are expressed by additions to the sign. For instance, the root of a character would express metal in general, while an appended sign would indicate that the particular metal intended was copper. The peculiar structure of the written character of the Chinese is favourable to scientific classification; so that of the 214 radical characters of the Chinese, it is observed by Mr. Davis,† that 160 serve at once as component parts in the written designations of all known objects in the animal, mineral, and vegetable, kingdom: hence a large portion of their literature consists in dictionaries and encyclopædias, mere nomenclatures of classification. The adoption of one written character, as the vehicle of popular instruction, amidst all the varieties of local dialects, has given to the Chinese civilization that unity of tone, by which it is so remarkably distinguished. On the other hand, the total separation of the written and spoken languages of China, has prevented both from attaining the natural perfection of speech. The spoken language has been left in a rude and barbarous state; while the written, cultivated as a science of symbols, exercising the pedantic industry of the learned, and shut out by its very nature from all immediate sympathy, with the free movements of the heart and imagination, exhibits in its most perfect state, a mere juxtaposition of general ideas, incapable of conveying those nice distinctions of thought and shades of sentiment, of which the human voice, and the alphabet which paints it to the eye, are the only adequate expression. Mr. Davis‡ speaks favourably of the Chinese poetry, which he distributes under three heads,—1. Songs and odes; 2. Moral and didactic pieces; 3. Descriptive and sentimental. It is obviously, therefore, confined to the lower departments of the art: and in the specimens which have found their way into the languages of Europe, we meet chiefly with a description of outward objects and events, and of the simple emotions which they immediately excite in the mind.

* Frerèt, sur la langue Chinoise; also Morrison's Dictionary and Grammar of the Chinese Language.

† Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. ii. p. 326.

‡ Ibid. p. 393.

ART. VI.—TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE, DESIGNED TO VINDICATE RELIGIOUS AND CHRISTIAN LIBERTY. Vol. I. London: Effingham Wilson.

FOR a considerable time past Tracts have been issued at short intervals, by an Association in Oxford, best known as the PUSEYITES, of which an account was given in a former Number of the TEACHER, (Vol. II. p. 1.); and also by a Roman Catholic Association in London, which, employing some of the ablest writers of that body, as well as selecting their most popular treatises, publishes at the low price of a penny or three-halfpence each, (with a reduction on a quantity taken for distribution,) a tract of a size usually sold for sixpence or more. These two sets of Tracts have one object in common, though they are not by any means friendly to each other, namely, the restoration of the Empire of *authority* in matters of Religion. They both, no doubt with an equal desire of promoting the welfare of souls, by inculcating upon them the danger of falling into damnable errors, urge the readers to place themselves under the direction of the Church,—the infallible Church of the respective parties—and to place their hopes of salvation in the due observance of the ordinances of religion, as prescribed by these churches. Both of these Societies evidently consider themselves as acting members of an *infallible Church*, though one of them *must* be, and both may be, involved in gross error. Besides these two series of publications, there are many others in extensive circulation, in a tolerably cheap form for distribution, which, without directly recommending authority in matters of faith, support the doctrines usually termed *orthodox*, as if thoroughly established, and make no scruple of thundering their anathemas against all who differ from them. These hold out the Scriptures as their rule of faith, denying the authority claimed by the Editors of the two sets of Tracts above referred to, but as they proceed on the supposition of their own interpretation of them being infallibly right, and that all who differ from them of course hold erroneous opinions, opinions injurious to their present welfare as well as contributing to their eternal damnation, they have an equal tendency to prevent freedom of inquiry. The one party refer to a traditionary authority of the Church, and would have its dictates enforced by the civil power; the other relies on its interpretation of Scripture, and would enforce its dictates by synods, presbyteries, church sessions and the like, punishing by exclusion from ordinances, those who

even venture to listen to heretics, unless they make humble submission. It is true that all these bodies have a few points in common, particularly the doctrine of the Trinity, but then the points of difference are also very numerous, so that amongst the number of *infallible* churches, differing from each other, as to what is requisite for salvation, they must of necessity inquire what claims these several bodies have, that they may select, or rather whether any body of men can have any claim whatsoever to consider themselves as the infallible directors of others. To assist in such inquiry, another series of cheap Tracts (though from the want of sufficient sale, or sufficient contributors to bear the loss, *less cheap*,) was commenced in October 1839, and continued monthly till the present volume was completed. The suspension of the publication for a time, (for we hope it will be only a suspension,) was evidently occasioned by want of encouragement, and the twelve published, though they may still be had separately, are now collected in the volume before us. The object of publishing them is to counteract the other Tracts, by asserting and defending *religious* and *Christian liberty*. The editors, whosoever they be, have had recourse to some of the best Tracts of a former period, in doing which they follow the example of the other Editors, and like them they do not exclude themselves from the use of new matter when supplied with it. The volume published, however, only contains one original Tract, the eleventh of the series. Two of the Tracts are from the pen of JOHN MILTON, the first and the tenth, and certainly they are productions which cannot be too extensively circulated, going, as they do, to the foundation of religious liberty, and establishing that foundation upon a solid rock. But it may be objected,—Is not this claiming infallibility for Milton or for ourselves? No—for it is not any doctrine, or set of doctrines, which is thus said to be established, but the fact, that there is no infallible church in existence, that nothing is infallible but what God has expressly revealed, and that no man or body of men, no pope, council, or assembly, has any right to judge or condemn the opinions of others, in understanding that revelation.

> Who with another's eye can read?
> Or worship by another's creed?
> Trusting thy grace, we form our own,
> And bow to thy commands alone. SCOTT.

The volume, and each of the Tracts separately, has this sentence of Milton, as a motto on the title-page:—"Books are not absolutely dead things, but do contain a potencie of life in

them, to be as active as that soul was whose progeny they are: nay, they do preserve as in a viol the purest efficacy and extraction of that living intellect that bred them. Many a man lives a burden to the earth; but a good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit imbalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life." Such *precious life-blood* is "The Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes, showing that it is not lawful for any power on earth to compel in matters of religion." Those who are themselves the slaves of the authority of councils, assemblies, synods, all composed of fallible men, bring it as a charge against Unitarians, that they are fond of quoting and resting on the opinions of distinguished men, claiming Milton and Locke and Newton in favour of their opinions; but when it can be fairly done, are not the opinions of each of these *master-spirits*, whose greatness even those most adverse to them, cannot deny—are not, we say, the opinions of Milton or Locke or Newton, if we must have recourse to authority, deserving of more attention than those of any assembly of divines that ever met since the time of the Apostles, howsoever they may deceive themselves or others with notions of their infallibility? We would not take even Milton as our guide and director, but we would much rather take him than the Council of Nice or Trent, or than the Convocation of the Church of England, if we must renounce the Scriptures as our authority, and the Lord Jesus as the only head of his church. And it is only in this way that great names are produced as authority by Unitarians.

This first tract was addressed by Milton to the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England, and is printed from the edition of 1659. It commences with asserting that there have been two things "ever found working much mischief to the church of God, and the advancement of truth, force on the one side restraining, and hire on the other side corrupting the teachers thereof." To the former of these he confines himself in the present tract, and promises that his argument "shall be drawn from the Scripture only, and therein from true fundamental principles of the Gospel to all knowing Christians undeniable." The *matters of religion*, with which he argues that no civil power should interfere, are explained to be "such things as belong chiefly to the knowledge and service of God, and are either above the reach and light of nature without revelation from above, and therefore liable to be variously understood by human reason; or such things as are enjoined or forbidden by divine precept, which else by the light of reason would seem indifferent to be done or not done; and so likewise must needs appear to every man as the precept is understood. Whence,"

says he, "I here mean by conscience or religion, that full persuasion whereby we are assured that our belief and practice, as far as we are able to apprehend and probably make appear, is according to the will of God and his holy Spirit within us, which we ought to follow much rather than any law of man, as not only his word every where bids us, but the very dictate of reason tells us, Acts iv. 19: *Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you, more than unto God, judge ye.* That for belief or practice in religion according to this conscientious persuasion, no man ought to be punished or molested by any outward force on earth whatsoever, I distrust not, through God's implored assistance to make plain by these following arguments." Having thus stated his object, he argues in support of it, from the general principles of Protestantism, inferring that those who condemn the Papists are more guilty when they themselves believe only as the state believes. "It is the general consent," says he, "of all sound Protestant writers, that neither traditions, councils nor canons of any visible church, much less edicts of any magistrate or civil session, but the Scripture only, can be the final judge or rule in matters of religion, and that only in the conscience of every Christian to himself." In proving this by various arguments and quotations from Scripture, answering objections and explaining difficulties, the treatise is taken up, and the whole is so connected that it is not easy to make extracts, but it is hoped that many knowing the subject, and considering the character of the Author, will read and judge for themselves. We think there are parts which would not have been written by Milton had he lived in these days, but it would have been unwise in any Editor to have attempted to mutilate or change even a single word. There is annexed an extract from a later work of Milton, "A Treatise of true religion, heresy, schism, toleration, &c.," printed in the year before his death, 1673. Part of this extract, respecting heresy, has been often referred to, and we shall not repeat it now, but we consider it as deserving a place in the memory of every Christian, as a guide for his conduct towards those who differ from him. There are also two sonnets, bearing on the same subject, addressed to the Lord General Cromwell and Sir H. Vane. Another Tract, entitled "Areopagitica, a speech of Mr. John Milton for the liberty of unlicensed printing, to the Parliament of England," is the tenth of the Series. Our press is at present so free that the republication of this may appear unnecessary. When it was spoken, a license had been deemed necessary before a work could be printed, and we are in great measure indebted to it for our present freedom. Still as the

Editors justly observe, "the only security for this and all our liberties consists in the public mind being impregnated with the manly and generous sentiments which Milton inculcated for a time in vain, upon our English Areopagites." True it is that we live in times when there are many who would gladly abridge our liberty, and if the churches should succeed in their effort to get power into their hands, we shall feel that though our lives and even property might be spared, yet that some Sir Andrew Agnew or Sir Robert Inglis may think he is serving God, by introducing a law to forbid Unitarians to assemble for religious worship, or at least to print any work attacking the Trinity or any other doctrine received by the ruling party. A tribunal of justice may be influenced to take away our property, Houses of Parliament may be influenced to pass such laws, as well as Corporations to reject dissenters, as we have seen in Edinburgh, however respectable, merely because they are not with the ruling party. As observed in the preface to this little volume, "the battle of religious and Christian liberty (for the liberty is two-fold) has yet to be fought," and it is only by inculcating again and again the doctrine of these Tracts, that it can be fought successfully. It is not for Unitarianism, or any other ism, but for the right of every man to form his own judgment on every religious subject, without being injured in his property or civil rights either by Acts of Parliament, as in former times, or by the influence of clerical or sectarian bigotry.

"When did ever our Blessed Saviour, who held all power in heaven and earth, and could command legions of angels, where or when did he, in the midst of dangers, opposition and abuses, ever oppress or punish even his unbelieving and implacable enemies? When did ever Paul, who had the power and assistance of the Holy Ghost, and the power and assistance of miracles, where and when did ever he show any resentment to his bitterest foes among the Jews, or his most idolatrous gainsayers among the Gentiles?"

Yet both might have done so on the same plea of saving souls, had not the spirit of the Gospel been different from the spirit of the high-priests and their followers in all ages. The extract preceding the last sentence is from the second tract, "The Craftsmen, a Sermon, by Thomas Gordon, Esq.," Author of the Independent Whig, Cordial for Low Spirits, &c., and also the Translator of Sallust and Tacitus. The name of Gordon may not be familiar, like that of Milton, but though not to be compared with the latter, he was well known a century ago. He was by birth a Scotchman, and came to London in the reign of Queen Anne, with a view of supporting himself by literature. He was first a

teacher; but having made himself conspicuous in the Hoadleyan controversy, in which he took the side of religious liberty, Mr. Trenchard, a wealthy Whig member of Parliament, and also a writer, took him to his house, where he lived till Mr. Trenchard's death in 1723. They published in concert Cato's letters, and commenced the Independent Whig, which Mr. Gordon continued alone. Sir R. Walpole rewarded Mr. Gordon's exertions with a place, which he retained during the remainder of his life, which terminated in 1750. The Independent Whig was published weekly, and was so offensive to some of the bishops, that a prosecution was threatened to suppress it. This led to the publication of the Sermon now republished, which was written in the manner of Daniel Burgess, a popular but peculiar preacher of that day, and went through six editions. The greater part of the 19th chapter of the Acts was paraphrased and applied. The opposite conduct of Paul the persecutor and Paul the Christian preacher; the attempt of the sons of Sceva to cast out a demon in imitation of Paul and in the name of Jesus, with the words of the man having the evil spirit, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?" and above all, the conduct of Demetrius and the *craftsmen* in his employ,—supply matter for cutting remarks on the high church party. Many of these remarks are just enough, and well deserved; but we do not admire the application of wit and sarcasm to such subjects. The concluding passage will, with that already quoted, give a fair specimen of what the reader has to expect, though not by any means amongst the severest passages.

"Let us now view Paul, and see what terrible arms he bears, that are so frightful to the craftsmen. He was a stranger, he was a dissenter, he had no equipage to dazzle people's eyes, no pompous garments to win their reverence, nor wealth to bribe their affections; he sought no popularity by indulging men in their vices or encouraging them in their errors. In short, all the numerous advantages of his adversaries, the priests, were so many obstacles and disadvantages to him, the apostle. To conclude, he had only truth on his side, which rendered him an overmatch for all the priests then in the world. All the privilege, all the advantage which he desired, was a fair hearing. This it seems he had obtained of the town, and it had its effect: here was his crime, and here began the priestly fury, the fiercest, the most brutish of all others. Shameless men! was it not enough that reason and religion were both against you, and that you would neither be proselytes to them yourselves, nor suffer with your wills that others should; but must you likewise be proclaiming *their* invincible power, and your own imbecility and nakedness, by virulently using direct, undisguised force to stop their mouths? What impudence! what folly! what, you that

boasted your conformity to the law, and your establishment by the law! you that were the possessors of all scholarship! that were proprietors of the arts and sciences and of the great endowments given for their support! you that instructed the young and the old, and controlled the consciences of both! you that were the sacred administrators of religion! you that shut and opened heaven and hell! you that were the privy counsellors of the Gods! in the name of amazement what could undermine you, what could annoy you? or if you are not hurt yourselves, why do you oppress others? by this method you do but show your cloven feet. 'Jesus we know, and Paul we know, but who are ye?'"

The third Tract, and the last which can be noticed at present, consists of "Sketches of the characters of Charles I. and II. and Oliver Cromwell, contained in the introductory chapter to the history of the early part of the reign of James the Second, by the late Right Hon. C. J. Fox." The work from which these sketches were taken was the production of one who was for a long period the Whig leader of parliamentary opposition, and with scarcely any exception, indeed we do not recollect one, the able and consistent advocate of liberty and peace. During the short period of his influence as a Minister of the Crown, he showed that in office he was still the friend of man, and almost in his dying moments achieved the abolition of the slave-trade, which his great rival had also advocated, but failed in accomplishing. It was the will of the great Being who directs all things, that he should be removed from this scene at the time when short-sighted mortals thought that he was most wanted, and it was not till more than twenty years after that a decided advance was made in the attainment of civil and religious liberty. His nephew, Lord Holland, adopted his principles, and faithfully adhered to them, and now that he too has closed his mortal career, let it not be forgotten, that he was ever ready to advocate his principles both in his scene of action, the House of Lords, where few have the resolution to support such opinions against overwhelming numbers, and also at public meetings.

Mr. Fox's work was a fragment only of what had been projected, but his nephew and other friends justly thought that it was too valuable to be suppressed, and it was accordingly published. The introductory chapter was devoted to a cursory review of preceding events, especially of the great struggle between Charles the First and the Parliament; the civil war which ensued, with the termination of it in the sway of a military despot; and the restoration and reign of Charles the Second, eldest son of the king, who had been beheaded. The se-

lection from it is well made, and those who have not read the work itself, will do well to peruse it, as it will materially assist them in forming a judgment respecting that important portion of English history. We shall only quote the concluding paragraph for the sake of making a few observations in explanation:—

"Whoever reviews the interesting period which we have been discussing, upon the principle recommended in the outset of this chapter, will find that from the consideration of the past to prognosticate the future, would, at the moment of Charles's (II.) demise, be no easy task. Between two persons, one of whom should expect that the country would remain sunk in slavery, the other that the cause of freedom would revive and triumph, it would be difficult to decide whose reasons were better supported, whose speculations the more probable. I should guess that he who desponded, had looked more at the state of the public; while he who was sanguine had fixed his eyes more attentively upon the person who was about to mount the throne. Upon reviewing the two great parties of the nation, one observation occurs very forcibly, and that is, that the great strength of the Whigs consisted in their being able to brand their adversaries as favourers of Popery; that of the Tories (as far as their strength depended upon opinion, and not merely upon the power of the Crown) in their finding colour to represent the Whigs as republicans. From this observation we may draw a further inference, that in proportion to the rashness of the Crown in avowing and pressing forward the cause of Popery, and to the moderation and steadiness of the Whigs in adhering to the form of monarchy, would be the chance of the people of England for changing an ignominious despotism for glory, liberty and happiness."

Now if in this description of the parties, we understand by *popery* the sect of adherents of the Pope, *i. e.*, the Romanists, the parties have so far changed; for the Tories of the present day have a peculiar abhorrence of popery, whilst the modern Whigs are favourable to the Romanists being admitted to the fullest participation of all civil rights and privileges; but if by popery we more correctly understand the spirit of popery, *i. e., of slavish submission to human authority in religion,* then the Tories and Whigs will hold the same position now which they did at the time of the Revolution; though uneducated or prejudiced men may regard the Whigs as encouragers of Popery, and the Tories as its opponents, so much are we swayed by mere names. The charge of leaning to republicanism is also brought against modern Whigs, and it were to be wished that some of those opposed to Toryism did not give too much cause for it; however, this is a subject foreign to our purpose, which

is to recommend the Tracts to our readers, and induce them, if possible, to promote the circulation of them. We do not recommend them as perfect productions, but as able productions of able men, calculated to promote the best interest of the human race. On a future occasion we may take some notice of the remaining ones, and in the mean time would particularly recommend the eleventh, the only modern one, as peculiarly suited to the present time.

Δ.

## Art. VII.—ON THE CHRISTIAN RULE OF FAITH.*

Between all human speculations on the evils of our moral condition, and the doctrines of revelation on the same subject, there is a most essential and remarkable difference. Philosophy has at all times taken two opposite courses. As if it were possible to deceive individual consciousness, attempts have been made to establish the abstract perfection of man. On the other hand, it has been tried to reconcile him to his present state by forcing upon the mind the folly and hopelessness of contending with the irresistible power of fatality. The course pursued by Revelation avoids these extremes. It acknowledges the evils of our nature without disguise or reserve: it describes them in their appalling magnitude; and while it offers effectual means for a complete triumph over those evils, it teaches us that the efficacy of the remedy may at all times be defeated by the freedom of the human will.

This fact, however, has been frequently seized as the ground of an insidious objection against revealed religion. "Revelation," it is said, "boasts of disclosures relating to the invisible world, and our eternal concerns in it;" we are told that our salvation greatly depends upon our acquaintance with the Scriptures; yet no department of knowledge is so full of doubt and obscurity as that whose exclusive object is the study of Revelation itself. Christians, from the beginning of their preaching, became as divided as the philosophical sects of antiquity; and after the lapse of eighteen centuries continue equally hostile to each other. This objection was directed with particular keenness against the Reformers, in the sixteenth century, and is still urged in disparagement of the churches which sprung from their preaching. Now, it were vain to deny the fact that the wildness of speculation, and consequent divisions which appeared as the immediate results of the separation from Rome, not only shocked the feelings of many eminent and highly religious men who were inclined to a reform, but staggered the faith of even those whom Providence had raised to achieve its noblest work in these latter ages.

Yet a cool and dispassionate study of the Bible must produce the conviction that, though the *reasons* of the Divine mind for

* A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford on Palm-Sunday, April 4th, 1830, by Rev. J. Blanco White, A.M. of Oriel College. "For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you."—1 Cor. xi. 19.

allowing these unquestionable evils, remain nearly as much a mystery as if there had never existed any communication between heaven and man, the *fact* of their existence forms a conspicuous part of the view which the Bible gives of the future state of things between the period of the establishment and that of the final triumph of the Gospel. If, therefore, the direct and positive proofs of Revelation cannot be invalidated, it is as unphilosophical as it is unfair to assail it with the charge of not accomplishing that which it never engaged to do; and the more so, because, as if to anticipate the objection, it has with superhuman knowledge given us a distinct and positive warning against indulging our expectations of immediate benefits from religion, beyond the express promises of God.

Far from raising these expectations to an enthusiastic height, as the founders of all false religions have done, the Son of God has declared in the most emphatic words, that the extinction of doubt and contention was not intended as one of the immediate benefits of his ministry. Such, indeed, were the vain hopes of the superficial, or yet uninformed persons who attended him on earth. But observe the boldness of the declaration by which he exposes the futility of those hopes. "Think not (he says) that I am come to send peace on earth: I come not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and a man's foes shall be they of his own household."*

And here I cannot help remarking the extraordinary lesson which experience affords us on this very point, that we may learn to distrust our theoretical ideas of perfection when we are tempted to apply them to the plans of Divine Providence. It is a fact that the greatest corruption of Christianity had for its foundation a human attempt to remove and prevent all divisions among Christians, and that in proportion as that scheme succeeded, so did the moral efficiency of Christianity decline. The assumption of infallible authority by the Church of Rome, it must be confessed, was a most plausible theory to fill up a seeming deficiency in the Gospel. Here, indeed, was a Divine Oracle for the guidance of Christians; but as it was couched in human language, it could not but be affected with respect to us, by the inseparable imperfection of all verbal signs. The sense of Revelation could not be plainer than that of the words in which it was conveyed. Here the blind pride of man was ready to suggest that this could not be consistent with the wisdom of God, because it did not satisfy our own wisdom. Arguing therefore

* Matt. x. 34—36.

from this assumption, it was soon settled, that since it seemed necessary to the completeness of Revelation that there should be an *infallible* interpreter of the Bible, such an interpreter must somewhere be found; and since it was desirable that Christians should live in perfect unity, they must be forced into that unity by some authority of human appointment. But what were the results of this impious attempt to improve the plans of God in respect to mankind? We have only to cast a glance over Ecclesiastical history, in order to answer the question. We have only to compare the times of Romanist supremacy with those of Protestant freedom. In vain was the wisdom of man employed to remove the evil which Christ had predicted. The existence and extent of religious dissension under the fullest authority of the Popes, is attested by the blood of their victims; whilst the ignorance, the gross corruptions, the profligacy of the Christian world, at that period, bear witness that the most extensive conformity may originate in the most unchristian spirit.

Let this, however, be observed by the way, for I do not aim at controversy but edification. My purpose is to elicit some light from the Scriptures in regard to the fact asserted in my text, "that there must be also heresies in the church;" and to apply that light to the regulation of our own conduct.

Whatever clouds conceal the final cause of the permission of moral evil, there cannot exist a doubt that, in its nearest approach to us, it proceeds from the power of the human will to determine our conduct, and the right of our reason to the final settlement of our opinions. Revealed religion does not undertake to remove that power, fatal as it often is to the cause of truth, virtue, and happiness. All that Revelation offers is light sufficient to assist the honest heart in making his choice, and strength to perform what a right choice shall dictate. How then could the Gospel, without contradicting itself, engage so to control the wills of men, and to overrule their understanding, as to prevent their differing in views and conduct? All that we have a reason to expect is that honesty and sincerity will extenuate error; and this expectation we find encouraged by the spirit of the Gospel, as well as by individual passages in the Scriptures. Now, if Revelation will not deprive men of their freedom, must it not multiply the occasions of mistake and discord, by the very nature of the moral trial in which it places us?

The analogy, in this respect, between every kind of progressive knowledge, and that knowledge from above which enables us to see spiritual things only "as through a glass darkly," deserves particular attention. The enlargement of our faculties, in both cases, by adding fresh scope, adds fresh power to our

will. Progressive knowledge, unless it be systematic (a character which we cannot find in revelation, according to our notions of system), by multiplying *partial* lights, multiplies also partial shadows—by adding calls on calls to the exercise of judgment, makes the chances of error more numerous. It is true that as these chances increase in number, the danger may be less in each of them; but this entirely depends on the use we make of the fresh accessions of light. In a word, our responsibility increases as our intellectual condition is exalted. From the instinctive perception of this truth it is, that low and degraded natures prefer total darkness to partial light, both in spiritual and temporal subjects. Hence the melancholy attachment of whole nations to the dead silence of a midnight ignorance, and their support of a despotic power, which equally prevents discussion on things relating to the temporal and to the eternal concerns of mankind.

A true Christian should not thus degrade himself by shutting his eyes to the real circumstances of his mortal condition: he should not deceive himself as to its dangers, or vainly endeavour by artificial means to evade them. Men may dream of a more perfect universe, and tax their ingenuity in forming plans to root out the moral evils which beset them. But this is like wasting the seed-time of the year in endeavouring to discover some powerful specific for the extirpation of every weed and noxious plant from the face of the earth. Let us not mistake our position in the intellectual creation of God. It is as impious as it is absurd to attempt a change in the laws of that creation. The small field alone committed to our care—the field of our mind and heart—is the proper object of our moral industry. In vain should we try to clear even this, the best portion of our inheritance, from the effects of that sin which brings a curse upon the earth. "In sorrow must we eat of its fruit all the days of our life;" and whatever be the pains we take in its cultivation, "thorns and thistles shall it bring forth," which if not checked in their growth by daily labour, will inevitably choke the good seed of the Gospel. Nor can we stop this evil by keeping from our souls the light of knowledge. This desperate experiment has often been tried by deluded Christians; but the night of ignorance is the appropriate season of growth for the most noxious weeds of the heart and intellect. What then remains for man but to court light, to remove every thing that can intercept its rays, and gird himself to his daily task, whatever that may be, under his individual circumstances?

But how shall we ensure such success as the infirmity of our nature, assisted by the spirit of God, can attain?—What are

the peculiar duties of men professionally devoted to learning, and especially to that kind of scriptural studies which, though absolutely necessary to the Church of Christ, have almost constantly distracted it with heresy and schism?—shall they seek repose in servile acquiescence, or careless indifference?—shall they, for the sake of unity, set up an oracle, and bind themselves to defend its answers?—This would be to shun the trial, to avoid the task set before us. Our duty, on the contrary, is to investigate the true nature of that trial, and, trusting in divine assistance, boldly yet humbly to fight the good fight of Christians.

For this purpose we should consider, that though revelation does not disclose every reason why God has allowed Christianity to be the occasion of heresies, yet it clearly states *one* use of this trial. "There must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." I shall only remind the learned part of my audience that the original of approved is δόκιμοι; a word which derives its moral signification from the process by which the purity of the precious metals is ascertained. One, therefore, of the reasons why heresies are permitted is, that the sincere followers of revealed religion, or, as we might say, the *sterling* Christians, may appear, and be distinguished from that baser sort of believers who nominally follow the Gospel, from thoughtless habit, or mixed motives.

But it will be asked, by what kind of touchstone shall we distinguish these genuine followers of Christ?—Of various persons, equally learned, equally honest, who take the most opposite sides in religious questions, whom shall we acknowledge as the *approved*, and whom shall we avoid as the heretic?

In order to answer this difficult question, we must lay it down as a principle, that no absolute certainty should be expected in that which is positively declared to be a matter of moral trial and discipline. At no period in the history of revealed Religion are we able to discover a criterion of divine truth, which doubt could not assail and obscure. But what is still more remarkable,—the definiteness of the Rule of Faith, or rather what might be called the *technical* means of applying it, has been gradually diminished in the progress of Revelation, leaving to the understanding and will of man a larger field of activity and trial, in proportion to the length of the previous discipline afforded by the course of nature and revelation.

It is indeed a great mistake to suppose that because the Gospel is a more advanced and perfect Revelation than that which was made through Moses, it must therefore have provided more

means for leading men as it were by the hand: that it must have appointed not only *one* judge, but an interminable series of infallible oracles, who, like Moses, may decide every religious question, without doubt or responsibility on the part of each individual. This would be placing Christians under a discipline far inferior in character to that of the earliest periods of the Jewish people. In a word, this supposition of the Romanists is the same in character as if any one expected and demanded that the strength and confining power of the contrivances by which an infant is made to walk, should increase as the infant grows to youth and perfect manhood. The progress of Revelation, as I will endeavour to show by a few instances, has proceeded upon an exactly opposite plan.

The Israelites, when just called out of Egypt, in a rude semi-barbarous state, to wander in the desert, had a leader to guide them whose communication with God is represented as that of a man talking with his friend face to face. A less plain and decisive rule of Faith and action would not have sufficed for the people whom Moses had to lead to the borders of the land of promise: a people, indeed, who, in spite of daily miracles, were constantly ready to break out into rebellion. After their establishment in Canaan, we observe that the means of consulting the divine will became more rare, and less certain; for in that state the Israelites had become a settled nation, in a progressive state of improvement, who could be left more to themselves in the application of the former Revelation. Lastly, the vehicle of divine truth, in a later age of the Jewish polity—the voice of the Prophets—demanded a great exercise of judgment and discrimination in those who were to choose between the declarations of the true and the false prophets. This period had been foreseen by Moses, and the difficult trial to which it would put God's people, may be estimated by the words in which he provided against its dangers. "If there arise among you a prophet or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee saying, Let us go after other gods which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams; for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God, with all your heart and with all your soul." In this passage, evidently written with a prospective view to a more improved state than that in which the book of Deuteronomy was composed, we find that the definitive judgment of a most difficult question on miraculous evidence is committed to the

Moral sense, with the general spirit of the previous Revelation for its guide.

A moment's reflection on the awful trial which this passage must have brought upon the Jews in regard to the miracles of our Saviour, should be enough to convince us that the Spirit of God never intended to establish such an *infallible* external rule of Faith as the Romanists have always contended for. The Jews of our Saviour's time might, and probably did apply the passage I have just quoted, to escape the force of Christ's miracles. And yet it pleased God to leave them in a degree of perplexity which in many cases must have led to the rejection of his Son. The contest, indeed, which arose on this very ground is most strikingly recorded by St. John.* "Therefore said some of the Pharisees, This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath-day. Others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? And there was a division among them." The division was on the very point to which Moses's rule applies—namely, the character of miracles when apparently in opposition with the former Revelation. We know, with certainty, that those who, following the *spirit* of the Old Testament, decided in favour of Christ's miracles, judged rightly. The others, however, had a plausible support from the *letter* of the law. Both, however, were left to stand or fall by their own decision. The one party was ruined by "their *evil* heart of unbelief," the other, saved under the guidance of "an honest and good heart," assisted by divine grace.

Analogous to this plan of trial is the supernatural dispensation which, in regard to the Rule of Faith and morals, we may observe in the New Testament. As the infant Church of Israel was placed under the miraculous guidance of Moses, so the rising Church of Christ had the Apostles, and their companions, who, endowed as they were with supernatural gifts, might establish her Faith, and commit it inviolate to the primitive Christians. But when the Church had grown into confirmed strength she was left to a *sure* but undefined guidance of the Spirit of God, with the volume of the Scriptures for its only *external* aid. Miracles ceased, supernatural gifts were withdrawn, and, after a fiery trial of persecution, the moral trial of doubt, heresy, and infidelity began, never to cease till the second coming of Christ.

From this view I believe we must conclude, that in proportion to the increase of our natural powers of discrimination, and our means of weighing evidence, will our trial in regard to religious

* ix. 16.

truth become more difficult and delicate. This, however, should render us the more anxious to fulfil the object of that trial. Nor should we be at a loss to ascertain the divine purpose in placing us under such discipline. As God permitted the appearance of false prophets among the Israelites, that the attachment and love of his people to him might be exercised by perplexity; so the obscurity of controversy has been given to Christians, that their love of Christ, "in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwelleth bodily," may be tried as gold in the furnace.

We, therefore, must not expect to find an infallible rule by which to remove all doubt in the interpretation of the Scriptures. What, indeed, would be the *moral* advantage of truth elicited by a process altogether mechanical? The sure hope of final certainty, not in regard to every abstract religious truth, but to safety in spite of human error,—arises from the love of God in Christ, which should be the chief guide in our decisions. This is in fact a rule in strict conformity with that given by Moses to judge between the true and the false Prophets. As it happened in the time of the beloved apostle, "many false prophets have gone out into the world." But we cannot hope for a better rule to preserve ourselves from their snares than that which the same apostle gave to the infant Church. "Hereby know ye the spirit of God; every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh (*i. e.* every spirit that confesseth the work of redemption, accomplished by Christ in his true and perfect human nature) is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God." Whatever views or doctrines diminish our trust in Christ, and disparage the work of our redemption, belong, we may be sure, to that spirit of Anti-christ against which St. John cautioned the early Christians, as being already in the world.

Now the use of trial, or discipline—for all discipline consists in trials—is, by frequent experience of danger, or error, to make men familiar with, and habitually attached to that which constitutes their means of safety. In regard to the Christian doctrines, it is unquestionable that the sources of doubt and perplexity are often multiplied to inquisitive minds, especially to those who, with an unlimited, and unfettered love of truth, make theology their profession. But why should we regret the existence of this peculiar trial, if we bring to it a pure and disinterested love of Christ? Let his love be our ultimate *rule* of *Faith*, and we need not fear. That such a rule will absolutely preserve us from abstract error, is what we cannot presume to expect; but that it will defend us from what-

ever might endanger our eternal happiness, it would be unchristian to doubt.

He knows little of the nature and object of revealed religion who can take offence at its want of means to produce absolute certainty in regard to doctrines. Had revelation disclosed the mysteries of the invisible world, and left them without veil or cloud, heaven would have gratified and encouraged that ambitious thirst of knowledge which was the occasion of man's first offence. Were the communication of supernatural knowledge the main object of revelation, the gospel would leave man's will as rebellious and unchanged as we inherit it from our sinful parents. Supernatural light the gospel does certainly give; but it is such a light, as by leaving us in constant apprehension of error, obliges the sincere Christian to work his own salvation in fear and trembling. It is such a light as, being sufficient to discover the right path to heaven, will not indulge our curiosity with a full view of the immeasurable extent through which it winds. It is such a light as, without totally unbinding our eyes, in regard to our God and Saviour, will yet kindle that burning of our hearts within us, which will urge us to keep in his company on our weary pilgrimage, and not let him depart from us "when it is toward evening, and the day is far spent."*

Thus far have I endeavoured to trace the views of scripture in regard to the existence of heresies and divisions in the Church; but I cannot conclude without touching upon the *relative* duties which result from the preceding statements.—The whole, however, of these duties may be summed up in one word—Charity. But let me not be misunderstood, as if I would hide under the loveliness of that name a careless indifference to Christian truth. It is a most sacred duty to oppose what we conceive to be *unscriptural* error; but, on the other hand, it is still a more Christian duty to oppose it under a humble conviction that the infallibility of the scripture does not confer a similar gift upon us. God in his wisdom has thus wonderfully provided the means of improving our minds, without injury to our hearts; of leading us to all substantial truth, without destroying our sympathy for those whom we conceive to be wrong. Want of *intellectual* sympathy is the very essence of bigotry, while bigotry is the most effectual hindrance to the preservation of Christian faith in the hearts of the wavering, as well as to the recovery of those who have deserted Christ for a false philosophy. We should indeed contend for "the Faith which was once delivered to the saints:" but we should con-

* Luke xxiv. 29.

tend in the spirit of that great Apostle, who, conscious of his own early errors, and having experienced the evils inflicted on the Church by those who would rather see the Gentiles continue in their false and degrading worship than expose the law of Moses to an imaginary contempt, gave this memorable advice to the most eminent members of the Church of Philippi: "I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing."* Let us, without prejudice to the interests of the system of scriptural truth which forms the centre of our Church-union, endeavour at all times to imitate the truly apostolic patience and forbearance which St. Paul recommends in regard to those whose faith is still of a low standard. "Whereto we already attained" (in common) let us walk (as brethren in Christ) by the same rule, let us mind the same thing, (and avoid contention,) while, with the apostle, we cultivate an ardent zeal to speed our own progress towards the mark of our calling, let us temper that zeal with a fraternal tenderness for those who are willing to enter on the same course, and yet cannot persuade themselves to begin it at the very point from which *we* start. However clear the *remote* logical connection of certain points, with the "truth as it is in Jesus," may be to *us*, let us beware of making the whole of Christianity stand or fall with our systematic deductions. Dissent even upon what may be called *secondary* doctrines, may be a sufficient ground for refusing admission into a particular communion, where the points in question are expressly settled in authorized articles. But this sort of exclusion tends only to the preservation of internal peace within definite portions of the Church of Christ; yet without interfering with that hope of salvation through him, which all Christians cherish in common. The censures with regard to which (acquainted as a painful experience has made me with the incredulous mind) I implore all the tender anxiety of sincere charity—are such as leave to the wavering but one alternative. Far be it from the ministers of the gospel to tamper with false views, or lax systems of scriptural interpretation. But let them bear in mind that positive declarations that whoever maintains certain views *must* be an infidel, are likely to force that necessity upon many whose imperfect faith, had it not been thus severely quenched, might have grown into the

* Ph. iii. 14.

fulness of Christ. I do not deny the necessity of such declarations in some cases, nor question the right of competent judges to make them: I only entreat, by the mercies of him who would not break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax, that when duty shall call upon us to demand a certain belief as the indispensable condition of Christian hope, we make *charity* preside over our knowledge. Christianity, in itself, is a perfect whole; a chain of revelation which runs from beginning to end of the Bible; and heavy indeed must be the responsibility of him who, with an irreverent spirit, tries to draw its links asunder. But as "in the house of our Father there are many mansions," so we may expect that various degrees of *knowledge*, added to general yet sincere *faith*, will obtain admission into the heavenly inheritance. I must, in conclusion, repeat what, were it not of vital importance, I should fear to have said too often—We must not compromise the truth; but in doing our duty we should constantly pray that we may so use our peculiar advantages as not to discourage the weak and doubting from approaching the Saviour of men; and that on giving a final account of the flock, we may not find to our sorrow "that through our knowledge a weak brother hath perished for whom Christ died."

## Art. VIII.—CULTIVATION OF THE PINE (*le Pin maritime*) ON THE SHORES OF GASCONY.

Economy is the welfare of states as of individuals. By economy, in its best and widest sense, is meant, that just and wise distribution of means and efforts, which out of the given conditions produces the largest sum of good and happiness.

To spend little is but one and a very meagre branch of economy, in many instances no economy at all. In states especially, to gather much is at all events equally important. When we look around upon the world, survey the numbers in want almost of their daily bread, while the earth given to man to be subdued and rendered productive by the labour of his hands is still, in an infinite number of cases, totally without culture, and *never* except with a few rare exceptions producing what it is capable by skill and industry of being made to produce, it is impossible not to believe that our knowledge of the science of political economy is in its very infancy; its true principles little practised or understood. Man is seen on all sides in that most affecting of all situations, willing to labour, crying for the privilege of being allowed to work, starving in want of the merest necessaries of life, while the bounteous earth lies spread around him, offering her liberal rewards for labour, and not finding hands.

What inexhaustible mines of wealth yet unexplored does the surface even of our own well-peopled and well-cultivated British Islands present; what sources of riches, strength and happiness lie buried in the bogs of Ireland alone!

Soils far more ungrateful have, by a judicious and economical culture, been made the fruitful source of wealth and felicity, and perhaps there is no contemplation more useful and agreeable, than that of such a picture.

The manner in which sand hills, such as those which, covered with wiry grass, line many of our shores, have on the south-western coast of France been rendered useful and productive in a high degree, is a striking example of well-directed and successful efforts of this nature.

In the Departments of the *Gironde* and of the *Landes*, on the shores of that stormy ocean which raves between the mouth of the Gironde and Bayonne, the most magnificent pine forests are at this day waving, where not many years ago was nothing but a dreary and threatening desert of sand.

These forests cover an immense extent of land round *Teste*

and the basin of *Arcachon*, and might be extended so as to cover the whole of the above-mentioned coast, an extent of sixty French leagues, or about one hundred and fifty English miles.

Teste and the basin of Arcachon will be found, on consulting the map, to lie on the shores of the ocean, in the southern part of the Department of the Gironde, from which the Department of the Landes extends southwards. Every one in the least acquainted with French geography has heard of the *Landes*: of those immense level plains,—and has pictured to himself their dreary monotony—their shepherds, elevated on stilts, and wrapped in grey sheep-skins, leaning upon their staffs, and watching, motionless, the flocks scattered over the measureless pasture.

The force of the western wind has raised upon this coast, as upon many others, hills of sand, from thirty to sixty metres in height (a metre is something more than an English yard); the French give these sand hills the name of *Dûnes*; they are composed entirely of the dry sea sand, driven inwards in various places, as upon some of our own coasts.

These sand hills having attained a certain elevation fall, are driven forward by the wind, and invading the plains behind them, menace the Landes with inevitable destruction.

Populous towns have fallen victims to the advance of this slow but, as it was long thought, irresistible enemy. The *Dûnes* advanced annually, and the gradual destruction of the productive plains might be predicted with mathematical certainty. Even the city of Bourdeaux itself seemed doomed, sooner or later, to perish under this deluge of sand.

This state of things at last excited public attention, and towards the end of the last century, the means of arresting this fatal progression were sought for—and, as is the usual consequence of being sought for—found.

A man of the name of *Bremontier*, we do not know whether he is yet living or not, imagined a method of staying the plague, and of rendering this element of desolation and despair a source of wealth and population. He formed and executed the project of covering these moving hills with forests of pine, (*le Pin maritime*,) the roots of which, by conglomerating together these light particles, and forming them into heaps of solid earth, might fix them permanently in their place, and arrest their further progress.

About the year 1587, this experiment seems first to have been tried, and the *Dûnes* were soon covered with an immense wall of verdure, which, promising to protect the plains in the interior, held out also the prospect of a considerable profit in

themselves. The revolutions which since then have agitated France, and which, as a sensible French author remarks, " Se font toujours en invoquant le bonheur des nations, et dont l'effet immediat est de suspendre ou de paralyser les entreprises et les travaux qui leur sont utiles,"—are always made in the name of happiness, and which, for the time being, have the effect of interrupting those plans and labours on which happiness depends. The various revolutions which have distracted France have interrupted at different times the cultivation of the *Dûnes*; the operation has proceeded slowly, and one hundred thousand Hectares of the *Dûnes* are still in their primitive state.

Fifteen thousand Hectares are now covered with the Pine; those plantations which date from the time when Bremontier began his operations, now present to the eye, in place of the desolate sand hills, magnificent forests, " waving majestic above the restless ocean."

" These sublime objects are thus brought together, and the voice of the surge below unites with the deep breath of the winds as they wave these dark plumes in the air; this magnificent spectacle is more especially to be admired upon the *dûnes* of *Moulan*, planted in the days of Bremontier, in the neighbourhood of *Teste*—magnificent spectacle!—the basin of Arcachon—the lighthouse—the Cape Feret, thrusting its sandy point into the ocean, complete the landscape."

The *Dunes* extend sixty leagues, being in breadth from three-quarters of a league to three leagues: the hills are intersected by vallies, called in the country *Lédes*.

The trees are raised from seeds—cast on the spot on which they are intended to grow—they are not transplanted: when the seed is sown, the moving of the light sand is prevented by covering the ground with brambles or young pine branches, fifteen hundred faggots of these being necessary to cover one Hectare: the seeds are sown thick, and when the young plants are of seven or eight years, the first thinning is made. If there were any means of cheap transport, these thinnings, sold at Bourdeaux, would be extremely profitable. After this thinning, the remaining plants grow with increased vigour, and in ten years reach the height of fifteen to twenty feet; at the end of twenty-five years they produce turpentine.

The collection of the turpentine does not necessarily injure the tree; in the great forest of Teste, which is of a date long antecedent to the plantations of Bremontier, there may be seen trees of three hundred years standing, which have been cut for turpentine till their huge trunk presents only a hollow cylinder, yet their tops are still green and flourishing.

When these pine forests have attained to this growth,—

"Nothing can exceed the majesty of the scene—the 'religious horror of the woods,' celebrated by the Latin poets, is here felt in a supreme degree; these lofty slender trunks spring upwards straight and proportioned as the thousand columns of a gothic cathedral, supporting in the air a roof of gloomy verdure, the wind which bends their tops spreads throughout a deep voice of mystery, and a balsamic odour of incense is diffused from these lofty branches clothed with eternal green."

Various sorts of plants thrive under the pine, though to several the deposition formed by its decayed leaves is destructive: the holly, the broom, the little white oxalis, the delicate fumaria, fumaria claviculata, flourish admirably.

"The pine extends its hospitality to a whole population of charming plants; the soil is adorned with verdant hollies, broom waving its golden plumes, mountain ash with delicate foliage, ferns covering the earth with their large green beautiful leaves, (which ferns, if burnt, make excellent potash,) and ivy, so darkly and brightly green."

These plants flourish—

"But those tribes of lichens and parasitical plants which infest the forests of deciduous trees here find no shelter—the dry bark of the pine affords no harbour for them, and, except when surrounded by the clinging ivy, raises its clean brown column unobstructed to the heavens.—Il ne demande pas tous ses sues à la terre."

He asks not of earth her more generous juices: the soil in which he rejoices is a dry light sand, where his roots can spread without difficulty—sandstone rocks are as much to his taste as *Dûnes*; in either he thrives and flourishes, drinking in the air through his innumerable pipes of leaves—his leaves affording, indeed, his chief means of nourishment, for stripped of them he invariably perishes.

There does seem to be good husbandry in thus converting the impalpable air into fuel, shelter and commodities of great value to man. When the turpentine is to be collected, which is first done when the trees reach twenty-five years, the business is proceeded in with much care and method. A selection is first made of all the ill-grown unpromising trees; these are treated so severely, that they perish under the operation, but the rest are managed with more care, and the business so conducted that neither their growth nor health appears to be in the least impaired.

The first class of trees, or those destined to perish, have long incisions made on all their four sides by the axe of the "resinier,"

who continues to deepen and widen his trenches, till the tree perishes—they will endure under this treatment seven or eight years.

The more promising plants, even when they have attained their twenty-five years, are not touched till they attain to such a size that the arms of the woodman cannot meet round them. When the forest has received its last clearing, the trees remain about two hundred to the Hectare, and standing seven or eight yards distant from each other.

"The first year an incision is cut, about fifteen or eighteen inches in length: this incision is made carefully and by degrees in the course of the first summer,—in time it is carried to the summit of the tree, the incision is hollowed out to about the depth of a crown piece: when the first incision is completed, another is made on the opposite side; but on trees that are to be preserved, never on the four sides."

The turpentine flows into this channel immediately, in different degrees of abundance: a tree standing alone will yield from thirty to forty pounds of turpentine; but in the forest they will not yield more than eight or ten.

The yield of the first year is not collected, it is suffered to flow into a hole scooped at the bottom of the tree, where it forms a sort of cup for the reception of the future produce. A Hectare of pines produces from twenty-five to sixty francs net to the proprietor, (that is, from £1. to £2. 8*s*. sterling,) according to the age of the plants. A pretty considerable profit from what was once an unprofitable, and worse than unprofitable, desert. The *Resinier* forms with the shepherd and the fisherman, the characteristic population of the *Landes*.—He lives in the depths of his dark pine woods, in a small cottage festooned with vines, a few yards of open ground surround him, converted by his industry into a fruitful garden; sometimes he has a field and a cow, and then he wants for nothing; his tools are few and simple, a small axe and a light ladder. The turpentine collected is divided with the proprietor.

A company established in the neighbourhood of Teste carry on the business of converting the raw material into the substance demanded by commerce. Turpentine is, however, properly a simple substance, and may be used as it comes from the tree; combined in various manners, it produces a variety of useful matters.

The soft turpentine, "*resine molle*," is the turpentine as it comes from the tree mixed with various other substances—the *Barras* is the turpentine collected in the incision: this is the best, and is exported in great quantities.

The "*resine molle*," purified by various processes, gives common turpentine, Venice turpentine, oil of turpentine, the residue of which is common resin: such are the parts of this branch of human industry.

The infinite teeming earth seems, even now, but to be beginning to open her riches; man is yet only guessing at the powers of the mighty mother—only gathering the first scanty fruits of the wealth lying hidden in her bosom, as the reward of science, exertion, enlightened benevolence, and peace.

"*M. Cousin to the Students of the Sorbonne.*

"If in this assembly any young man may be found who has raised himself by degrees above his fellow-students, having no resource but his own labour and ability, no support but his own conscience, no fortune but the trophies he may this day obtain, let that young man not lose courage—the road of life lies before him, covered it is true with obstacles—his course obstructed by ten thousand rivals—but let him take courage and persevere. I *promise* him success, but on this condition alone—that with generous ardour he shall persist in the habits of exertion which we are here to-day to honour and reward. Impress this truth upon your minds—*Man is the master of his own destiny.* It is the fiat of eternal justice, that an honest and determined will shall attain its object—that a weak and feeble determination shall be smitten with the curse of disappointment. The everlasting harmony between merit and its rewards is the foundation of human society. This law, in the worst of times, has never been altogether destroyed; its progress is the standard of moral advancement—its triumph is the honour of the age in which we live; and we ought to be grateful to divine Providence for this his sublime law, which, to borrow the words of the ancients, binding, by chains of brass, suffering to what is evil—blessings to what is good—disorder and despair to passion and vice—and the peace which passeth show to virtue—bestows success on labour—and empire on activity and courage directed to a just and noble aim."

M.

ART. IX.—A PRESENT FROM GERMANY; OR, THE CHRISTMAS-TREE. Translated from the German by EMILY PERRY. London: Charles Fox.

THIS is a welcome addition to our youthful store of Christmas amusement; and these elegant little translations will be gratefully acknowledged by many a little lover of Fairy lore. They are rather a miscellaneous collection of allegories and fairy tales, with one or two papers on natural history interspersed. We cannot quite make out to our satisfaction the story of "Victorine," as in the commencement her transformation is represented as the work of a veritable fairy, and at the end it appears as if she had only been dreaming a very profitable dream. The concluding story is a genuine fairy tale, leaving all probability far behind. We are tempted to extract the following communication between "Day and Night," which strikes us as very graceful.

"The birds were warbling sweetly in the hedges, the reaper with his sickle was joyfully returning home, innumerable swarms of insects hovered around the flowers, and the industrious bees, laden with honey, hastened to their cells, mindful of the command, 'Work while it is yet day.'

"Then Day proudly and haughtily addressed quiet and dusky Night.

"'Poor sister, how I pity you! What have you to compare with my ardent sun, my blue heaven, with its fleecy white clouds, and my active, restless life? You have indeed reason to be quiet and humble, and to glide away when I approach, for I awaken to a new existence what you have killed, and rouse those whom you have sent to sleep. Man may well say, that "the night is no man's friend," for beneath your shade the visible world grows spectre-like. Alas! how many dread your approach! The sick, whose pain and suffering you increase —the careworn, whose anguish you strengthen,—become cheerful and courageous when I appear in my rosy light, encircled with joyous being.'

"'My brother,' said quiet modest Night, 'I ask not your compassion. We are both the servants of God. I refresh and strengthen what your breath has exhausted and parched. He who touches the edge of my garment forgets your illusions, and the burden of his daily toil; gently he reclines his head upon my bosom, and, like a mother, I fold my wings around him. Are his eyes red with weeping? I fan him with the breath of another world, and send my children, the Dreams, to call up before him the loved and lost, and again he feels himself rich and happy. You speak of your sun, you poor brother! Millions of suns come forth at my bidding, and glitter like stars in my boundless

firmament, and your limited blue heaven is the seat of eternal worlds. Do I desire your active, restless life? Oh, no! quietly, gently, but never wearied, I create and maintain the kingdom of life, ever leading it towards perfection.'

"The fiery boy, Day, was prepared with many other arguments, but his powerful sister threw her veil over him, and, speechless and impotent, he sank upon her bosom. She covered him lightly with her mantle, and then ascended, as queen, her throne of twinkling stars, and the angels of heaven came and obeyed her commands."

# INTELLIGENCE.

## MEMOIR OF EDGAR TAYLOR, ESQ., F.S.A.

All who are interested in the character of the larger branch of the legal profession, and its standing and position in society, will desire to see a record of each eminent member of that class, as he passes off from the scene of his labours. In such an instance as the present, the record is of more extended value, as showing that great professional success is compatible with unusual proficiency in literature, and extensive literary productions; and that with industry, even a short measure of life is quite sufficient for the attainment of both.

Mr. Edgar Taylor was the fifth son of Mr. Samuel Taylor, of New Buckenham, in Norfolk, and a descendant of Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich, the author of the Hebrew Concordance, a very learned and highly distinguished Presbyterian Minister of the last century, whose writings have not only been held in high estimation by some of the most eminent divines of the Church of England, but have in part had the honour, singular towards a non-conformist, of being republished by a bishop of that church. He was born at Banham, in Norfolk, on the 28th of January 1793. He received his education at Palgrave School, Suffolk, under Dr. Lloyd, a very excellent classical scholar.

In the year 1809, he was articled to his uncle, the late Mr. Meadows Taylor, of Diss, a solicitor of large practice, and the successor to a business which has now been carried on by his family for upwards of a century. He here acquired a good knowledge of law, and particularly of conveyancing; and also found time in his leisure hours to attend to subjects of literature, and particularly to acquaint himself with the Italian and Spanish languages. In the year 1814 he came to London; and in 1817, he entered into partnership with Mr. Robert Roscoe, one of the sons of the celebrated Mr. Roscoe of Liverpool, the author of the Life of Lorenzo de Medici, then also commencing the practice of the law, and opened chambers in King's Bench Walk, Temple,—beginning life, as he says himself in some notes left behind him, with only a very small capital, and that borrowed.

Of the nature and particulars of his private practice it will not be requisite to say much. He continued in partnership with Mr. Roscoe until that gentleman retired from the profession on account of ill-health, and he afterwards associated with him other gentlemen as partners, one of whom, however, died before him. It was two or three years after he began business that the writer of this memoir first knew him. The official establishment then consisted of one writing clerk only: at the time of his death it was amongst the most extensive of the agency houses in London.

It will not be out of place to state that his business arrangements

were of the most accurate and complete nature. In all matters relating to accounts, particularly to those which strictly belong to the science of book-keeping, he was especially skilful and accurate. He was probably the first solicitor, or one of the first, who applied the Italian or double-entry system to solicitors' books. With the assistance of a friend, once his fellow clerk, but now an eminent accountant in the city, he arranged his books from the first upon this plan, and during his whole life they were so strictly kept, that, every bill for every business, finished or unfinished, being first made out, he had a balance sheet of the whole concern struck twice a-year, showing the results and state of the concern at those moments, and checking, as is the nature of the Italian system, every posting and the casting of every cash account. So particular was he in this matter, that even if, as occasionally happened, there was an error of only a single penny appearing on the balance sheet, he would keep clerks engaged, even for two or three months, in examining the accounts till it was found out. The following note appears in one of his private books of account, and was written by him two or three years ago :—"I have had the complete series of my accounts with my different firms copied into a small book, with a copy of the profit and loss accounts. This, for curiosity, showing the progressive successful operations of $20\frac{1}{2}$ years."

To his professional talents it is not easy to do justice. He was a man of a very acute mind, and remarkable for his foresight and generalship. His own personal practice was principally in the Equity Courts. In the early stages of the most complicated suit he delighted to look forward to and provide for contingencies which could not occur till the cause had advanced to stages requiring years to arrive at: his memory, or at least his method, was such, that, on the contingency taking place, he had the whole previous arrangements in his mind. Though, latterly, the suits under his charge were very numerous, yet he always bore the particulars of each in his mind,—the objects of the suit, the parties to it, and the state in which it was. He rarely had to give two readings to any cause, however long its duration. Altogether, a man better fitted to the management of the most extensive business, even in its minutest details, can scarcely be conceived.

We have dwelt the more on Mr. Taylor as a thorough man of business, engaged in an extensive and successful practice, in order that, viewed with these serious occupations, his assiduous cultivation of jurisprudential and literary pursuits may be the more justly appreciated. We will now enumerate some of the subjects on which we happen to know that his pen was from time to time engaged. The most important of his works, "Wace's Chronicle of the Norman Conquest," his "Book of Rights," the "Lays of the Minnesingers," and his "Translation of Grimm's German Stories," are referred to in a notice in the Morning Chronicle of the 22nd of August last (from which an extract is subjoined);* a notice in which we feel pretty sure we can trace the pen

* "Notwithstanding the occupation arising out of an extensive professional practice, and an active participation in public measures, he found leisure for literary pur-

of an eminent German scholar, and an old and valuable friend of Mr. Taylor —a gentleman formerly leader on the Norfolk Circuit, but now retired from the bar. His "German Stories" were first published at an earlier date than that assigned by the writer in the Chronicle, and when Mr. Taylor was in the full enjoyment of his health.—we think in 1823 or 1824. We well remember his showing us, on the first publication of those stories, the long and most interesting letter of praise and congratulation from the late Sir Walter Scott, published in the second edition of his Stories, from which we extract the following passage : —"I have to return my best thanks for the very acceptable present your goodness has made me in your interesting volume of German Tales and Traditions. I have often wished to see such a work undertaken by a gentleman of taste sufficient to adapt the simplicity of the German narratives to our own, which you have done so successfully."*

To begin with his fugitive Legal productions :—He contributed many articles to the (Quarterly) "Jurist," then, we think, edited by his friend, the late Mr. Henry Roscoe. The following we believe to be from his pen : On "the New Chancery Orders of 1828;" on "Parochial Registration" (two articles in 1828 and 1832) ; and on "the History of projected Law Reforms in 1830, 1831, and 1832" (a most admirable article). He also was a frequent contributor to this journal. He wrote in it on all the subjects just named, and also on "the Local Courts Bill." This latter project he powerfully assisted in defeating. With respect to it, he wrote, at the request of several influential members of the profession, a most able pamphlet, under the assumed name of H. B. Denton, Esq., entitled, "Lord Brougham's Local Courts Bill examined." He had a few years before published another pamphlet on a previously pending bill, entitled, "An Estimate of the Brougham Local Court Bill, by an Observer."

It must not be supposed, however, that he was an opposer of legal re-

suits. He was a frequent contributor to the periodical press, and our readers had not unfrequently the benefit of his labours. He generally published anonymously, but in 1833 he gave to the world a 'Book of Rights' with his name, a valuable digest of constitutional acts from Magna Charta downwards, with able and original comments. He was attached to antiquarian and historical studies, as well as to the lighter literature which combines poetry with history. He was the author of an admired translation of the famous French metrical chronicle by Wace, entitled the 'Roman de Rou.' He composed a history of the German Minnesingers, with translated specimens, and was able, notwithstanding the sufferings of his latter years, to recreate his imagination by preparing a version of some of the admirable *Marchen* legends of the distinguished brothers Grimm, the banished Hanoverian professors. The second edition, under the title of 'Gammer Grethel,' was the last of his writings that left the press.

"But these lighter occupations never interfered with the discharge of sterner duties, nor with the more earnest studies founded on religious opinions. He sustained his severe bodily trials with fortitude and patience, and died full of the assurance of a Christian's hope, though he rejected many of the dogmata which constitute the faith of the more numerous Christian sects. He has left a name unassailed by reproach or imputation, and left the world without an acquaintance who does not lament his departure."

* See Gammer Grethel, ed. of 1839, p. 343.

form. Where real and extensive and not patchwork reform could be brought about, he was most anxious to assist in the work; but he objected to the system adopted by too many of our Equity Judges of altering for the sake of being able to say that alterations had been made, and of deluding the public into a notion that these alterations were really the extensive improvements which the public voice required. An extract from the preface to his second Local Court pamphlet will best show the views he always entertained on these subjects:—

"The following observations come from one who is as ardent a reformer of the principles and practice of our law as any one engaged in the work, and who on that account feels the more deeply the discredit brought on the cause by projects involving useless expense and unnecessary violence to the established order of business,—needlessly injurious to the interests of large bodies of respectable individuals,—changing anything and everything as if it was only for changing sake,—and swelling enormously that legal patronage which already has so great a tendency to convert into timid subservients a body of men to whom popular interests must look for their most efficient defenders.

"When it is manifest that the whole good which can be accomplished by an enormous machine,—the extent of the effects of which on society no one can measure, and which involves an expenditure exceeding the whole cost of the administration of justice in the Upper Courts,—could be effected with the smallest disturbance of the present system, at little or no cost, and yet with the most extensive effect, and so guarded as to protect society to the utmost against any mischievous consequences; and when we nevertheless see that the wildest and crudest scheme, notoriously contrary to the opinion of the leading members of the profession, as well as of the Judges, is urged on by the eager wilfulness of two or three speculative individuals, and will most likely be supported by a House of Commons laudably anxious for reform of abuses, but necessarily ignorant of the details of such subjects, and naturally prone to be dazzled by the most showy scheme; it becomes high time to consider what all this is to lead to, and to ask whether, if free scope be given to this school of regenerators, the institutions which they are professing to reform will long exist elsewhere than in the page of history?"

Besides the productions already mentioned, Mr. Taylor also wrote several articles in the Westminster Review and other periodicals, on other subjects connected with the state of the law,—particularly with reference to dissenters, and to that body of dissenters to which he belonged, and of which he was the legal organ for a long period of years.

The following were, we believe, among the general legal subjects he wrote upon:—"Parochial Registration;" "the Registration of Voters;" "Admission, &c. of Attorneys;" and "the Regulations of the Inner Temple." His articles and pamphlets on matters affecting dissenters were very numerous. We find some letters of his as early as 1817 and again as late as 1834, on "Religious Offences indictable at Common Law," on "the Laws affecting Non-conformists," and on "the Sense in which Christianity is part and parcel of the Law of the Land." An article in the Westminster Review of 1835, "on Sir Robert Peel's Dis-

senters' Marriage Bill," was, we believe, written by Mr. Taylor, and we know that he frequently wrote on the subject of the Marriage and Registration Laws. In 1828 he wrote an article in the Westminster Review on the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Laws, and also published on the same subject, as a pamphlet, a very striking and argumentative letter to Sir T. Ackland, which, we think, went through several editions. A general statement of the legal position of dissenters, and of the grounds for their relief, was published by the deputies of the three denominations of dissenters, and rapidly passed through many editions. This, we believe, was drawn up by him. He wrote also on "the Title of Unitarian Dissenters to Endowments," and on "the Admission of Dissenters to the English Universities."

His articles on antiquarian and literary subjects were too numerous to allow of any full enumeration. He was deeply read in the literature of the middle ages, and communicated many articles to the Retrospective Review on subjects of that nature. We know that there are articles of his there, or in the Monthly Repository, or elsewhere, on "Conybeare's Anglo-Saxon Poetry:" on the "Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum;" on "Physiophilis Specimen Monachologiæ," (an old German naturalist's satire on the monks of his time); on "Las Casas and the Slave Trade;" on "Sir J. Mandeville's Travels;" on "Burton's Diary," (two articles); on "Sale's Koran, and the Sects and Tolerations of the Mahometans," (several articles) and on "Young and Champolion's Discoveries in Hieroglyphics."

He was greatly attached to Biblical literature and church history, and we find articles on "The Reformation in Spain;" on "The State of Catholicism in Germany and Silesia:" on "Wetstein," the celebrated author of the Prolegomena;" on "Scipio Ricci, Bishop of Pistoia;" on "The Life and Times of Archbishop Laud," (two articles); on "Cave's History of the Primitive Church;" on "A newly recovered Work of Eusebius (the Chronicon);" on "The Culdees of Iona,"(an old sect of the Scotch Church); and also on the "History of the Transmissions of Ancient Books to Modern Times," and several Papers of Observations on the Controversy as to the Original Language of the New Testament.

He was an excellent linguist, and paid much attention to the structure of the modern tongues. Wes hould have mentioned, amongst his contributions to the periodical press, an article on "The Hamiltonian System of Teaching Languages." We believe he acquired his knowledge of the German after he was in practice as a solicitor. We know that several years after he commenced business, he was in the habit of taking French lessons, and well remember more than once finding his French master waiting for him late in the evening, while he was finishing the heavy business of the day. He must have had a pretty good knowledge of Spanish, as we recollect his once reading, off-hand, a legal document of considerable length written in that language. His knowledge of Italian was so good as to induce that accurate publisher Mr. Pickering, to request his assistance in revising the beautiful miniature editions of Italian poets. Much of Mr. Taylor's time, in the last few years of his life, was spent in

reading the Greek classics; and he has left a half printed work, the entire or nearly the entire manuscript of which, we believe, is finished, being a translation by himself of the New Testament from Griesbach's edition. He had, in an early period of his life, been engaged on an English re-publication of Griesbach—an undertaking which required great editorial labour. He has, we believe, left several other, and some of them very considerable, manuscripts, but what are their subjects, and whether any of them will be hereafter given to the world, we are unable to state. We understand that among the rest, is a highly characteristic Diary commenced in his 21st year—carried on till within a short period of his death, and, in the course of its progress, receiving from his hand the valuable edition of recollections of his earliest years—of all these we trust some account will be published, as we have reason to hope that a more extended biography than can be contained in a periodical journal will some day appear.

Mr. Taylor's style was remarkable for terseness, vigour, clearness, and originality of expression; his mode of reasoning a subject quite masterly. The pamphlet on Local Courts, to which we have already referred, is a model for a work of that kind—instead of being one of the decoctions of the common-place of the day, it is full of original thought. There is not a sentence in the whole sixty-four pages which has not a good idea and point in it; scarcely a word that could be touched without injury. Did our limits allow, we would gladly have made some extracts, more especially as, though caused by a wild scheme now we hope set at rest,* it is upon a subject which, in some shape or other, will last as long as the science of jurisprudence itself. Nothing can be better than the full, fair, and spirited statement of the real point at issue, viz. the comparative advantages of the "*central*" system, with its unity of principle and practice, and its extensive bar and highly endowed bench, exercising mutual supervision, and the "*departmental*" system, with its alleged saving in speed and cheapness. The difficulties which must always beset Local Courts, and the ill-will and litigation engendered by them, are next pointed out, in a manner rapid, but most lively and convincing. The remainder of the pamphlet is occupied in examining the details of the bill. This is done with a facility of handling and a freshness and vivacity of diction quite delightful. It is full of wit and sarcasm; but every sally is weighted with some sound reason enclosed in it; and there is no personality, unless, indeed, we condemn as personality the laugh at the restless Chancellor's impatience to be talking about a favourite scheme, instanced in his inability to wait the printing of the evidence on which the bill was founded; and seeing that this went to the whole and sole truth of the matter, it would have been difficult to have kept it in the back ground.

To return to our subject:—We ought not to conclude our remarks on Mr. Taylor's style without alluding to it as exemplified in those less important and more transitory productions of the pen, by which he was,

* The new practice of creating a great variety of Borough and other Courts, without uniformity of system or of jurisdiction—some exclusive, some not—is, in a measure, however, a new form of it.

after all, much better known to his friends and in his profession—we mean his business correspondence. He was by far the best writer of a business letter we ever knew. Rapid beyond conception, yet accurate and complete; clear and pithy to a marvel; unless, indeed, where the interests of his client required him to conceal rather than fully set out his ideas. In his letters more than in anything else, he was the wonder of the numerous clerks and pupils with whom, after the first few years, his office was always filled. He was in all things a constant subject of their observation and admiration; but well does the writer (who long studied under him) remember the surprise excited by his letters, evading, with consummate skill, the difficulties which could not be met, or meeting with the utmost boldness that which could not be evaded. And, while alluding to those who had the advantage of being in his office, and as a close to our enumeration of his intellectual qualities, the writer must add, as he is sure he well can, for all of them, that there never was one who did not, without hesitation, rate him as the first in all points of talent and business they had ever known.

Of Mr. Taylor's political and religious opinions it would not become us to say much here—all mention cannot be omitted. In both, he followed the steps of many generations of his ancestors; and though he differed widely in both from the bulk of his numerous personal friends in the profession, and from many of those out of the profession, we feel sure he was not the less esteemed by either the one class or the other, for quietly and consistently following those views, which all who knew him, knew him to entertain with entire seriousness and conviction. In his politics he was a whig: at least, what some time ago was so called; in his religious opinions a Unitarian,—thinking always, however, much more of general liberty of conscience and dissent, than of sectarian differences.

He was, for many years, as we have stated, the solicitor of the Unitarian Association, and a very leading man in all matters affecting the civil position of dissenters. He conducted the various applications for leave to perform marriages made by the Unitarians between the years 1825 or thereabouts, and the passing of the late Marriage Bill; and in this and other public matters, became well acquainted with many of the leading public characters of the day. He was not only nominated one of the commissioners for collecting together and examining the old dissenting registers, but was, we believe, deputed by the government to select two of the other commissioners, one from among the Independents, and one from among the Baptists, on whom the reliance of their respective bodies could be placed. In the business of this commission he took great interest; and, as of everything else he ever undertook, he made himself thoroughly acquainted with its details. He was attending to them almost to the day of his death.

Notwithstanding his political and religious opinions, he was sent for by Sir Robert Peel, on, we believe, the day after that statesman came into office in 1835, to give his opinion respecting a bill Sir Robert proposed to introduce respecting the marriages and births of dissenters; and on

his stating that he was surprised that, with his known political and religious opinions, he should be sent for, Sir Robert replied that it was on that account especially he had sent for him; and that having made up his mind to carry such a measure through, and to forego his own scruples, he immediately looked about for one who would command the confidence of the dissenters. We must mention another anecdote very honourable to Mr. Taylor, though exactly what all who knew him would have predicted. It is, that he refused an offer made, and afterwards pressed upon him, by a late Lord Chancellor, of an important and lucrative office or secretaryship connected with the patronage of the Established Church, merely because it was so connected.

One of the last matters of importance in which he was engaged, was the appeal to the House of Lords, lately argued and still waiting judgment in the Lady Hewley case. He was selected to manage this matter jointly with the former solicitors of the trustee by a large body of gentlemen in Lancashire; and was added to the business, not out of the slightest distrust or disrespect to the able gentlemen before engaged, but merely for the great reliance placed in his talents and abilities by the numerous body of Unitarians in the north of England. Though confined entirely to his room for the last eight or ten months, he devoted great attention to this matter; and partly to his exertions made in his sick room are to be attributed the able printed instructions and historical illustrations given to counsel on this important argument.

Though very decided in his political views, he meddled but little with many of the numerous legal contests so often springing out of political offences. In the year 1821 or 1822, however, under Lord Castlereagh's ministry, feeling strongly the danger to public liberty of a private society for instituting political prosecutions, he came forward to conduct the defence of several parties indicted by the constitutional association; and in conjunction with a most acute and learned member of the bar, now filling a judicial situation, so baffled the prosecutors by objections to juries summoned by a sheriff who was a member of the association, and by other legal obstacles, as to prevent, we believe, the conviction of any of the individuals he defended.

The origin of the illness which brought this remarkable man to an early grave, at the age of forty-six, is not known. He considered himself, we believe, as having no serious complaint until the year 1832; and after a violent attack he had in that year, he so far recovered as to be, or at least to appear in the enjoyment, for a considerable time, of tolerable health. Though symptoms of weakness had shown themselves earlier, they were not thought of much consequence by medical men. The complaint, however, of which he died, had taken root in 1832, if not earlier; and, with occasional intervals, he was from that time suffering until his death. The agonies he endured were most acute; and when the disease was not slumbering, of frequent recurrence—and certainly never was pain more stoically borne. The chief part of his writings above enumerated were composed during the last years of his life, and in his sick room. The "Book of Rights" was one of these. He rarely spoke of his sufferings, but in the preface to that book he alludes to them, and to the

diversion of thoughts derived from his occupation in the work. For two or three of his last years he was unable, from his complaint, to pass a whole night in sleep, and he made a constant practice of getting up at one or two in the morning for an hour or two, and of lighting his candle, and attending to his studies.

At the end of June he had a most serious and violent attack, which lasted some days. After this attack he felt clear that his life would not be much prolonged; and on recovering a little, he drew instructions for a fuller will, and set about making more complete arrangements than he had before made. He wrote to one of his partners to get the will completed without loss of time, "as he was then more fit for such matters than he should be again:" and he spent his time between intervals of pain, in going over, and tying up, and endorsing and setting down full particulars about all his papers and affairs, and in writing a variety of letters, to be opened after his death, to different persons, on matters he wished attended to, or explaining views he thought important to be understood. The coolness and composure with which all this was done was marvellous. He settled the draft of a long will as if it had been a client's—had parts re-copied and altered after it was engrossed; and, after it was signed, wrote two codicils with his own hand, to supply little matters he thought it best to leave expressed. His last codicil was a bequest of the printed copy and of the manuscript of his translation of the New Testament to his wife. When this was finished, he meddled no further with business, nor with those more laborious pursuits which to him were always as part of the business to be done. But, preparation having been the work of his whole previous life, he waited in quiet expectation, for the most mysterious passage in the soul's history, spending his time in cheerful conversation with his family and near relations, all of whom he had requested thenceforward to stay about him. An operation was thought of and nearly determined upon; and though he had a strong secret conviction that it was impossible he should survive it, nothing could be more cheerful than his readiness to undergo it. When it was at last abandoned at Sir Astley Cooper's instance, he then first stated he was quite sure they had decided rightly.

For the last three weeks he was slowly sinking, and upon the morning of the 19th of August ceased to breathe—so tranquilly that the precise moment of his death is not known, though it was watched for by his brother and attendants. He was buried at the New Cemetery, Highgate. Though he left no kind of direction, or expressed the slightest wish on the subject, the ceremony was arranged with as much of modesty and quietness as possible, in accordance with what most certainly would have been his desire; for, if he had an unpopular point of character, it was his reserve, and this reserve arose from a disgust and loathing, almost morbid, of any thing approaching to show or ostentation. Wide as his acquaintance and even influence was, it is to this point in his character we attribute his not being much more publicly and extensively known.

His great generosity should be mentioned. Though careful in his habits, and fully aware of the value of money, yet in matters of charity

which he approved, particularly those connected with education, he was most liberal. The writer has been himself a party to many applications to him for aid of this kind, and never remembers his not giving at least double what was asked; and many requests for a guinea, he remembers met by gifts of five. Yet so unostentatious were these, that he is very sure Mr. Taylor's immediate family were never aware of them.

His family and numerous relations, many of them themselves distinguished for literature or science, were greatly attached to him, and proud of their connection with him; and this attachment was if possible increased by important professional exertions (not necessary to be further alluded to) which he made for one of them during the last years of his life.

Mr. Taylor married in the year 1823, Ann, daughter of J. Christie, Esq., of Hackney. He has left a widow and an only daughter surviving. His father also is still living, though at a very advanced age. He had realised a handsome, though not excessive fortune. His executors are, one of his brothers, a pleader of eminence of the Inner Temple, (formerly a pupil of his own,) and two of his partners.

He, early in life, entered himself of the Inner Temple, and kept his terms. It was, we believe, a few years ago, his intention, had his health been tolerably good, but not altogether re-established, to have been called to the bar by way of retiring from practice; but he continued till his death a member of that class of the profession which he had first entered, and for the honour, reputation, and interests of which he felt always the deepest regard.—(*From the Legal Observer.*)

---

THE LATE MRS. BARBAULD.—NEWINGTON-GREEN CHAPEL.

Our readers will, no doubt, be pleased to hear, that a monument has been recently erected in this chapel, to the memory of this very talented authoress, and truly estimable woman. It is an elegant mural tablet, thus inscribed:—

In memory of
ANNA LÆTITIA BARBAULD,
Daughter of John Aikin, D.D.
and Wife of the Rev. Rochemont Barbauld,
formerly the respected Minister of this Congregation.
She was born at Kibworth in Leicestershire, 20th June 1743,
and died at Stoke Newington, 9th March 1825.
Endowed by the Giver of All Good
with wit, genius, poetic talent, and a vigorous understanding,
she employed those high gifts
in promoting the cause of humanity, peace, and justice,
of civil and religious liberty,
of pure, ardent, and affectionate devotion.
Let the young, nurtured by her writings in the pure spirit
of Christian Morality,
let those of mature years, capable of appreciating
the acuteness, the brilliant fancy, and sound reasoning

of her literary compositions,
let the surviving few who shared
her delightful and instructive conversation,
bear witness that this monument records
no exaggerated praise.

The literary and religious world are indebted, for this appropriate Testimonial, to Charles Rochemont Aikin, Esq., of Bloomsbury Square, Surgeon, Nephew to Mrs. Barbauld, and the adopted son of the worthy minister and his celebrated lady. The inscription was furnished by an elder nephew, Arthur Aikin, Esq., late Secretary to the Society of Arts, Adelphi.

We hail the erection of this monument as another symptom of the progress that has been of late made by the congregation meeting at the antique Presbyterian chapel on Newington-Green. With the assistance of the Unitarian public, they have placed their chapel in a state of handsome repair: they have considerably enlarged their library, and by the introduction of a department of *general* literature, much enhanced its value and usefulness; and they have commenced a Sunday School, which is already numerously attended, and promises complete success. The doctrinal lectures of their minister, the Rev. Thomas Cromwell, have also been the means of drawing unusual attention to Unitarianism in the neighbourhood; and attracted on every occasion full auditories. To all *such* "revivals" we unfeignedly bid God speed! especially when, as we understand is the case here, united efforts are made in the cause, not so much of a sect, as of the broad Christianity of Christ, consisting of two great elements, devotion to God, and Human Brotherhood.

*Postscript to the Article in this Number, on the Colleges of the University of Cambridge.*

To ensure a greater degree of accuracy in the calculation of the proportion between the total number of students admitted annually into Trinity College, Cambridge, and the number of students who obtain testimonials for ordination from that College, (see pp. 17 and 18 in this number of the Christian Teacher,) the following additional corrections are requisite :—

1. In p. 17, line 27, *for* 67 *read* 47.

2. In p. 17, line 35, *for* 433 *read* 413; and line 37, *for* 473 *read* 453.

3. In p. 17, line 36, *for* 50 *read* 100; and line 37, *for* 1389 *read* 1339.

The year 1840 in the table, p. 17, includes only the period from the beginning of January to the middle of November, at which time the numbers were collected; but in the nine preceding years, the whole of the twelve months in each year is included.

There were one hundred and twenty-one admissions into Trinity College in ten months and a half of the year 1840, and at the end of October 1840, there were one hundred and thirteen first year students or freshmen in the same college.

Hence the number of absentees from the number of admissions in ten months was only eight, and therefore ten absentees must be amply sufficient for the whole year.

If an allowance of ten absentees be assumed for each year in the table, the number of admissions will be reduced to 1339 for the ten years; and the average number in each year will consequently be 134 nearly. With these additional corrections, the proportion of the total number of the students to the number of the divinity students, (p. 18, line 15,) will consequently be as 1339 to 453, in ten years, from 1831 to 1840, or as 134 to 45 nearly, or as three to one nearly, for the precise proportion of 3 to 1 would be the same as 135 to 45.

In general terms, it has been stated by an experienced officer of Trinity College, Cambridge, that about one-third of the students go into the church, one-third into the law, and one-third into other professions and occupations; and, indeed, at the

present day, it can hardly be disputed, but that the lay students are decidedly more numerous than the divinity students, in Trinity College, Cambridge.

Even among the most numerous class of graduates, the Bachelors of Arts, the numbers of degrees taken exhibit nearly always a majority of the lay students over the divinity students in Trinity College, as will be seen from the following table of the numbers of the Bachelors of Arts, who graduated in the last five years, as members of Trinity College, in the University of Cambridge.

| | Number of the degrees of Bachelor of Arts, taken by the Members of Trinity College. |
|---|---|
| 1835 | 94 |
| 1836 | 89 |
| 1837 | 87 |
| 1838 | 76 |
| 1839 | 79 |
| | 425 |
| Yearly average | 85 |

The educational importance of the various colleges in the University of Cambridge may be estimated from the numbers of students who usually give a preference to those colleges from which they expect to derive the greatest advantage. All the names of the students who came up in October 1840, to commence their first academical year, and who are termed freshmen, were published in the Cambridge University Magazine, for November 1840, and their numbers are as follows :—

| | Freshmen. |
|---|---|
| 1. Trinity College | 113 |
| 2. St. John's College | 86 |
| 3. Corpus Christi College | 27 |
| 4. Caius College | 25 |
| 5. Catharine Hall | 22 |
| 6. Queen's College | 21 |
| 7. St. Peter's College | 16 |
| 8. Christ's College | 14 |
| 9. Clare Hall | 14 |
| 10. Emmanuel College | 11 |
| 11. Magdalen College | 11 |
| 12. Pembroke College | 10 |
| 13. Jesus College | 8 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 14. Sidney College . . | 6 |
| 15. Trinity Hall . . | 3 |
| 16. King's College . . | 2 |
| 17. Downing College . . | 1 |
| Total number of new students at the commencement of the present academical year in Cambridge . . | 390 |

THE

# CHRISTIAN TEACHER.

---

## Art. I.—THEOLOGY. From the German Conversations-Lexicon.

This word is derived from the language of the Greeks, among whom it denoted discourses on the Gods, and their relations to the world; and was considered as having three divisions—Physical, Political, and Mythical, Theology: the first,—as treated of by the Philosophers, who included Metaphysics under the term Physics; the second,—the Public Belief, as recognised by the State; the third,—as delivered by the Poets from the ancient traditions.

Among those Christians who spoke Greek, the learned, or scientific knowledge of religion was not at first called Theology, but Gnosis, (knowledge,) from which the Pistis (Belief, *i. e.* the common instruction in religion necessarily delivered to the people,) was distinguished.

In what *this* consisted, during the first centuries, is shown by the Apostolic Confession of Faith (called the Credo); which at the present time forms the text of the three principal articles of Christian faith in Luther's Catechism.

The expression Theology was first used among the Christian Fathers of the third and fourth centuries, by those who defended the Godhead of the Logos,—(the Word of John, i. 1, which became flesh in Christ;)—and the dogma, coined in the fourth century, of the Trinity. Abelard (who died in 1142,) first applied the term to knowledge of Religion in general, and wrote a "Theologia Christiana." It was then, and still is, used to signify Knowledge of Religion, *i. e.* a learned acquaintance with religion, or a learned exposition of its theoretical and practical doctrines.

To this science belongs;—the systematic arrangement of the whole subject, and the application of the philosophical, physical, historical, and,—when Theology rests on ancient writings,

—the exegetical evidences and facts, which tend to illustrate it. Since all belief, if it be not blind, must arise from personal knowledge, or at least be subject to it, every religious man is, personally, a theologian. But, since all men are not in circumstances which will admit of their procuring for themselves the knowledge requisite for establishing scientific belief, the unlearned must in this respect rest their belief on the testimony of the learned, just as in mathematics, physics, or history; and *their* belief, therefore, rests on authority;—but that of the learned must be based on personal knowledge. An exposition of the truths of Religion, furnished with as much learning as the knowledge and comprehension of the laymen, or rather, of the unlearned, can reach, is called Popular Theology. Since Religion is composed, partly of Belief, founded on either Knowledge or Authority, and partly of feelings and actions consonant with that belief, viz. the feeling of the existence of God, and our dependence on Him, and as a consequence, prayer to Him, and obedience to His known will,—Theology divides itself, like Religion, into THEORETICAL, and PRACTICAL: ("Dogmatic, and Moral.")

If the Theology be formed by reason, if it be merely a development of the religious ideas in the mind, with their relations to the aspect of the world, then it is called Philosophical Theology, as also Rational, or Natural.

In as far as it is acknowledged that Reason has received the laws by which she gains and comprehends religious ideas, just as Nature has received hers from God, the Creator of the world; and that Reason and Nature, or Creation in its completeness, are an expression of the designs of Providence and an effect of His will,—so far is this Rational, or Natural Theology, a Revelation from God, by which He has spread the knowledge of Himself among His rational creatures.

It is a *universal* Revelation, for it has reached all men, and a *primary* Revelation, for it began with the creation of the world.

It has been called Natural, however, because it was believed that the contemplation of Nature awakened it in the human mind. But if the expression relates to its origin, it is just as *super*-natural as is the origin, preservation, and government of the world. Since God, as Creator of the world, is the source of all that is Real, and True, this universal revelation can contain no errors, save such as have crept in by the fallible decisions of reason, and have been committed by Man in his observation of Nature.

From this is distinguished the *particular*, or *subsequent* revc-

lation, or that knowledge of religion which God has imparted, in later times, to individual men, as teachers of others. It has been called *Immediate* revelation, because it has been attributed to the direct agency of God upon particular men, without the mediation of the laws of nature. For the same reason it has been called also *Supernatural*, in contradistinction to *Natural*, though the latter also, since it has God for its author, may be called supernatural.

This is the most marked distinction between Supernaturalism and Rationalism, both of which, however, admit of many modifications.

There is hence also a REVEALED Theology, which has been sometimes called POSITIVE Theology, because it rests on historical authority, and has been given in distinct and express words and formulas, which are to be sought for either in a Holy Scripture *alone*, (as in the Evangelical Theology,) or at the same time in orally-transmitted traditions, and written declarations of a succession of inspired priests, (like the Roman-Catholic Theology.)

The application of philosophical knowledge of Religion to Positive Theology, is called the Philosophy of Religion. Since every particular revelation, as a single circumstance in the train of events, is an historical fact, which must be believed upon certain grounds,—each requires critical examination and proofs: the rather, that *many* positive Religious, give themselves out as Revealed.

The proof of a revelation must rest, then, not on the mere fact, that it was, at a certain time, and by certain men, declared to be a positive Religion;—but on the fact, that God, as the author of the Religion, exercised an immediate influence on these men, for their enlightenment;—in other words—that He *inspired* them. This proof is founded, next to the declarations of the inspired persons themselves, on miracles, and prophecies. But, since these again are historical facts, which require the same proofs; to the effect, viz. that they *were* immediate influences from God, and since, on the investigation of them, our judgment of the authenticity and credibility of the Holy Scriptures, and of the competency and disinterestedness of the witnesses adduced, so much depends,—the process of demonstration becomes so complicated, that it has lately been almost given up. The Critique which has recently appeared by Strauss, on the evangelical accounts of the Life of Jesus, has displayed this difficulty still more fully, although the historical fact, that Christ did actually live, teach, and lay the foundation of a religion for the world on his being an extraordinary man,

and inspired from Heaven, is placed beyond all doubt, by the present existence of the Christian Church.

In reference to each subsequent and particular revelation, the following principles are certain;—First; Since all truths, whether transcendental, (belonging to *pure Reason,*) or received through the senses,* come from God, and are therefore as firm and immutable as God himself,—the particular revelations can contain nothing which is in opposition to the Universal Revelation, or to religious ideas, and especially, to general truths, whether belonging to Reason or Nature: at all events, nothing of the kind, if it be found in the testimonials of the particular revelation, can be admitted as *essential* to it. Secondly; Since it would be inconsistent with our ideas of the wisdom and goodness of God, to suppose that He kept back from Mankind truths which they required to know for their salvation, for thousands of years, and then only imparted them to individuals,—the particular revelation can only have for its aim, to awaken, develop, guide, and expand the religious ideas contained in the universal and primary revelation. Thirdly; Since the revelation is given for Man, and for human reason, it can contain nothing which is either incomprehensible by the human mind, contrary to the laws of thought, or inapplicable to human life. Fourthly; Since all truths are closely bound by mutual dependence, and therefore Theology is necessarily dependent on the view of the world of the time being,—the particular revelation cannot go beyond the view of the world, (as in relation to Physics, Astronomy, Anthropology, Geography, &c.) which the human race at that time entertained, but must be contained within the limits of that view, or it could neither be received nor understood. Hence these limits will be perceived, in the relations of the religious ideas to the world; or, in other words, in the religious views of the world, which the revelation takes; and these views therefore will belong, not to the essence of the revelation, but only to the temporary, and gradually disappearing form of the particular revelation.

When these fundamental maxims were applied to the particular revelation contained in the Holy Scriptures, there arose Critical Theology, generally called Rationalism, but improperly so, for supernaturalism is not opposed to it; since Critical Theology still acknowledges a particular and immediate revelation, or at least *may* acknowledge one, and therefore may admit Supernatural agency; while *un-critical,* or *Literal* Theology, which considers every thing written in the Scriptures, *as*

* "Die vernünftige, wie die sinnliche."—Tr.

it is written therein, and *because* it is written therein, to be divine Truth, completely disowns the application of these four principles.

The Christian religion announces itself only as a particular revelation, and Christian Theology is also a *Revealed,* and (so far as it is based on the Holy Scriptures,) a *Positive* Theology. The founder of it did not aim at giving forth a system of Belief. The acknowledgment of the one True God, and Jesus as his ambassador, was sufficient for him, according to John xvii. 3. Just as little did any of his apostles give forth a system of belief, or wish to do so. Whoever acknowledged the one true God, and Jesus as His Messiah, or Sent, was baptized and considered a Christian. The nature of the human mind, which is ever struggling to connect all truths, and find a firm foundation for them, necessarily led to the formation of a Christian Theology, and the more so that among the Greeks and Eastern nations there already existed a philosophical theory of Religion, which the converts to Christianity brought with them.

Even so early as in the writings of John, Paul, and the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, the beginning of a Theology may be traced; not, however, consisting of precepts, but their own personal opinions, their own deductions from particular circumstances. So it remained until the close of the third century. The Fathers, Tertullian, Irenæus, and Origen, distinguish throughout their works, *Belief,* (under which term they include only that which the Apostolic confession-of-faith contains,) from the *Speculations upon* that Belief, or, from *Theology*; and declare this Belief *alone* to be binding and necessary to all, but Theology to be free and unconstrained, from which any one may select what appears to him most correct. And there it had better have been left. But, when the Emperors became Christian, they too mingled in Theological controversies, decided them, and made their decisions the Standard of Belief.

Hence arose Positive, or Church Theology, which has brought so much evil on the world. This first happened in the year 325, at the first general assembly of the Church at Nicea, where a purely speculative dogma, that of the nature of the Son of God, was decided, and the decision declared the standard of Belief.

But however bewildering this commencement of converting Theology into articles of Belief became for the Church, the assemblies persisted in the once trodden path, and held up their decisions over other theological controversialists, as binding Christian Belief; without perceiving how widely they were diverging from the path of Christ and the primitive Church,

and what seeds of discord they were sowing for futurity. Thus theological formulas on the connexion of the divine and human natures in Christ; on the Deity of the Holy Ghost; on the Trinity; on Original Sin; on the image of God; on the mode of action of divine grace; and at last on rites, such as Baptism, the Eucharist, Mass, &c.;—were all made articles of Christian Belief. The views entertained of the sources of Christian Belief and theological speculation were also gradually changing.

The apostles and their immediate disciples had only the Old Testament, and the oral instruction of Jesus, which they transmitted. At the close of the third century, the writings of the New Testament, which had meantime become known, were added to the Old; and the oral traditions were still connected with them, though they ought to have been laid aside, as having lost all authority, by the side of the New Testament, and become more and more uncertain, as the Apostles, their fountain head, in the course of time, withdrew. Endeavours were so eagerly made to fill up the vacancies thus caused, that at length the successive inspiration of a continuous line of priesthood was admitted, and thence the decisions of councils, and still later, those of the Popes, were considered as equivalent to revelations.

Here then Theology ceased to be a *science,* and took the form rather of a positive legislation, which it still retains at the present day; not only in the (Roman) Catholic Church, but even in the evangelical church; (in the latter by their symbolical books.) No science, save that of Religion, has ever fallen under such a misconception. But this is the reason why Christian Theology has never been at rest, but down to the latest times has ever raised the most bitter and eager strife. For, the attempt to change a science into a positive legislation must always inevitably fall to the ground; since it is the nature of a science, like that of Theology, to be constantly growing and advancing by further researches, and, in this particularly, by the progressive development of reason and more elevated views of the world. This was shown in the Middle Ages. However fearful was then the power of the Popes and their theological decisions, upheld as they were by bans and courts of inquisition, they could not prevent the newly-revived Aristotelian Philosophy from completely possessing itself of Theology in the eleventh, and thenceforward to the fourteenth centuries. Certainly this Philosophy was chiefly applied to the elucidation, development, and corroboration of the authorized Dogmas; but it carried on the development of many dogmas so far, and made the contradictions in many of them so apparent, by subtle queries, that it prepared the way not a little for the Reformation. On

the other hand, another party, called the Mystic, made it apparent that all the authorized theological formulas were of no value for a religious life, and insisted on the ancient simplicity of the Christian Belief, and on a Christian life.

The Reformation of the sixteenth century, both in Saxony and Switzerland, arose from abuses and improprieties in the constitution of the Church, which had spread abroad the feeling of an intolerable burden: and at first it was never intended for a reformation of the established Theology, but only of the abuses in the Church government. The reformers looked upon the established theology of the centuries preceding the eighth, as having an inviolable sanctity. They not only brought forward the testimony of those centuries as proofs, and held closely by their authorized doctrines, viz. by the Nicene and Athanasian creeds; but they asserted repeatedly that their only aim was to restore that ancient and purely-catholic Church.

But the strife soon began on theological grounds, for one part of the abuses in the church which Luther seized on and combated, had arisen out of the then dominant theory of the scholastic Anselm, justification, (remission of sins) only through faith in the vicarial satisfaction of the God-man. This theory, which he believed he had found in the Scriptures, was one firm point, to which he held immoveably fast, and from which he assailed penances, indulgences, masses, extreme-unction, and other satisfactions of the (Roman-) Catholic Church. Luther's adversaries soon pressed him hard on a second point belonging to the sphere of Theology, since they called to their support the Oral transmissions, the divine supremacy of the Pope, and the successive inspiration of the priesthood. Luther soon perceived that these sources of Christian information on Theology were not to be relied on; disclaimed them, and declared the inspired Bible *alone*, the true and certain source of information for Belief and Theology.

These two points show the theological character of the Reformation, both in Saxony and Switzerland. For since the Reformers in both countries, in the midst of their reforms of the Constitution of the Church, believed that the first seven or eight centuries of the Christian Church were entirely on their side, the thought never, at first, crossed their minds, of founding a separate Church, much less a new one. They only wished for an improved Church, or rather one brought back to the state in which it was in the first centuries. Just in the same manner they wished for no new Theology, but to make that of the ancient Church the standard.

The idea that Christian Theology ought to be free, like a Science, was so far from their thoughts, or those of their fol-

lowers, that they not only would not allow of the smallest deviation from the ancient authorized Theology of the Church, but they had no hesitation in sanctioning anew the theological decisions given out in the Confession of Augsburg, the Apology for that Confession, Luther's Catechism, the Articles of the Treaty of Smalkald, and the Formulas of the League; and in thus again giving to their Theology the unsuitable character of a legislation. The Reformed did the same, and princes and governments allowed themselves to be induced to compel adherence to such theological laws, by civil regulations. The consequence was, that the same effect was produced as in the Middle Ages. Not only did another party arise, the "Pietists" of the school of Spener, who, perceiving the worthlessness of established theological formulas, urged the necessity of *practical* religion; but the rapid progress of Philosophy, Exegesis, History, Criticism, and the Natural Sciences, produced also the Philosophy of Religion, or Critical Theology. The appearance of the latter was inevitable, for the Reformers had decided nothing clearly on one of their fundamental principles; viz. the Use of the Holy Scriptures; which they had declared to be the only source of information in Theology, and the final appeal in disputes. Had the Bible been a book written by Christ himself, with the intention of transmitting to posterity the purport of his religious precepts,—the state of Christian Theology had indeed been simple: and there had been only the alternative, of acknowledging Christ to be a man inspired by God, or not; and so of honouring his writings as records of his revelation, or of disowning them as such. But the Holy Scriptures are a collection of Books, written by his Apostles, and some early disciples of those Apostles; and they also contain those numerous writings which the Jewish nation held sacred: thus there are writings of dates which include nearly a thousand years; the productions of very different men, written by them for very different objects; and, even in relation to Theology and Religion, with very different ideas.

When the Reformers laid down the principle that the Holy Scriptures are the only trustworthy sources of revealed Theology, they ought, if they would have proceeded scientifically, to have instituted close researches into the nature, the use, and the elucidation of the Scriptures, and have come to some distinct opinion. But this was not done. There are, to be sure, among Luther's writings, many detached and candid opinions on the Scriptures, but they are isolated, and lead to no scientific conclusion.

With respect to the interpretation of the Scriptures, the Re-

formers only declared themselves against the allegorical interpretation, and in favour of the literal meaning, as that should be determined by the customary expressions of the language, the context, and parallel passages. But the expositions of the Bible which they had, were the same that had hitherto obtained authority in the Church, which they received unaltered, and which, as a point universally conceded, they could not think it necessary to prove, and establish in authority.

When posterity began to bring this opinion to the proof of research, those different shades of the more modern Theology showed themselves, which we have now to characterize. They may be divided into three great classes, the SUPERNATURALISTIC, the RATIONALISTIC, and the PHILOSOPHICALLY-ALLEGORIZING Theologies.

The SUPERNATURALISTIC theology was that of the Reformers, and of their times. It has three different forms, the *absolute*, the *relative*, and the *critical* supernaturalism, which arose one after another. At the time of the Reformation the whole of the Holy Scriptures was considered, both as regarded the words, and the contents, as a record produced by the supernatural influence of God (Inspiration); which contained the revelations of God and the history of them from Adam to the Apostles. Although written by different authors, and at different times, they were looked upon as one continuous work throughout, because the Holy Ghost was the sole author both of the contents and the words of all the books, and only employed the writers as his instruments. Thus there is in the whole Bible but *one* Revelation, which began in Paradise, and ended with the Apostles, and their disciples. The fundamental doctrine thus is, that the Bible (both as to words and contents) is *itself* the revelation, *is* the word of God supernaturally given; and hence that it contains, not only no contradiction of itself, but also no geographical, physical, historical, or other error. Hence it is enough, in order to prove any doctrine revealed, that it can be found literally expressed in the Bible.

This system of Theology continued to prevail in the reformed Church until about the middle of the eighteenth century; and may be found in the most celebrated treatises of those times, viz. in those of Melancthon, Strigel, Chemnitz, Hutter, Jno. Gerhard, Calov, Brochmand, Quenstädt, Baier, Hollaz, Buddeus, Baumgarten, Von Mosheim, Carpov, Reinbeck, &c. From the middle of the eighteenth century, after Joh. Aug. Ernesti, in his famous "Interpres Novi Test." had made the elucidation of the Scriptures dependent on philology and knowledge of antiquity, and Joh. Sal. Semler aroused criticism in Theology, this

view of the Bible became more and more abandoned, until in later times Hengstenberg, Hahn, Tholuck, and others of their party returned to the biblical theory of the Reformers, and sought anew to promulgate the *letter* of the Bible as Revelation.

At first sight this theory is the simplest, easiest, and most consistent. But it can by no means be maintained or followed out, since the Bible itself contradicts very strongly the supposition that God was a composer, and that it is word for word a divine writing; for not only is the Theology of its different books, viz., those of the Old and New Testaments, very inconsistent with itself, but the authors of the biblical Books followed (as they could hardly avoid doing) the defective views of the world of their times, as to Heaven, the Earth, the Stars, Mankind, Nature, and History. These defective views afforded the chief handle for the English, French, and German Freethinkers, in their attacks on the Bible and Christianity; properly, however, not on the Bible, but on the previously developed theories of theologians and the Church concerning the Bible.

Hence theologians were obliged to take another step, and proceed to Relative Supernaturalism, and assign limits to Absolute Supernaturalism, which they placed partly on the letter, partly on the contents. With respect to the words, it was conceded first, that the Holy Ghost accommodated himself to the style of the writer, (as Baier, 1686); next, that the Holy Ghost spoke, in physical and mathematical matters, according to the prevailing ideas, (as Carpov, 1737); next, that the Holy Ghost left the writers of the Bible to themselves with respect to the mode of statement, (as Baumgarten, 1759, and Töllner, 1771); next, that the Holy Ghost only acted in preventing negative errors, (as Reinhard). With respect to the contents, moreover, a limit was assigned to the theory of Inspiration by Reinhard, Storr, Döderlein, and Morus, thus far, that the Inspiration referred only to the religious part; that thus the Bible contained Revelation only in matters of Religion, but not in its geographical, historical, and other doctrines, in which the writers rather followed their own opinions, and the ideas of their times. The Revelation was thus limited to religious matters; and instead of the dogma,—*The Bible itself is the Revelation,—this* principle was promulgated: *the Revelation is in the Bible.* By these means many difficulties were avoided, and the Freethinkers especially, who had attacked the Bible on account of its historical, geographical, and astronomical doctrines, found their weapons drop from their hands: and yet this theory could not be carried out through all its consequences. For since all Theology

is ever dependent on the view entertained of the world, it was very difficult to determine what doctrines among those contained in the Bible should belong to religion, and what should not. For example, the biblical representation of Heaven as a vault covering the Earth, is so intimately interwoven with its representations of God, the angels, and the government of earthly affairs, that they can only be separated from one another arbitrarily. Just as little could a distinct opinion be formed as to what in the History of the Bible should belong to Profane and Religious History; thus, as to whether the Mosaic account of the creation, paradise, the fall of man, the Mosaic giving of the law, &c., should be considered as revelation or not. Further, the difficulty became insurmountable from this circumstance, that the Bible, with the spirit of its times, takes a completely Theological view of nature, and in the history of the Jewish nation, upholds the theocratical point of view, in which God brings everything to pass by his own immediate agency.

Hence it was resolved to go one step further, to abandon entirely the theory of inspiration of former times. And while it was still maintained that the Bible contained particular revelations, to concede that the writers of the Biblical books followed entirely their own judgment in the composition of their writings, and delivered the revealed truths as they themselves in their own minds comprehended them.

Yet even this view showed in its application, great and insuperable difficulties, and required, in order to raise it at all above arbitrary choice, the solution of a host of preliminary questions, the decision of which made apparent to every one the impossibility of founding a consistent theology on this basis.

For instance; it was asked,—is Revelation to be sought in the Old Testament also, and in all its books? Supposing that Moses and the prophets had revelations, is a like supposition admissible with respect to the authors of the historical books, the writings of Solomon, the book of Job, and others? With respect to the New Testament, have the gospels of Mark and Luke, who were not disciples of Jesus, equal authority with those of Matthew and John? And have the declarations of the Apostles equal weight with those of Jesus? Might not each comprehend the instructions of Jesus in his own peculiar manner, and modify them accordingly? Was Paul of equal dogmatical authority with the other apostles, since he did not himself hear Jesus, and must not we presuppose in him the influence of the Rabbinical theology which he had previously studied? And, since we only know the precepts of Jesus through the ac-

counts of the evangelists, are these accounts literally true? Have not the narrators probably intermixed their own opinions and views? Above all, by what rule are we to judge, whether a doctrine expressed by a sacred writer is to be looked upon as a really divine truth, or as an opinion formed by the writer's own judgment? All these questions arose, and indeed naturally increased in number, in proportion as Biblical Theology (*i. e.* the inquiry, what theological ideas, apart from the system of the church, are to be found in the Bible) was carried on, sometimes as a whole, sometimes in parts; and as the doctrinal ideas of particular writers, such as John and Paul, were sought to be developed. Nay, even in the expressions of Jesus himself it could not be denied that he was guided, in speaking to his contemporaries, by the religious ideas, which they had not first received from him, but had had long before; for example,—of the Inspiration of the Old Testament, the resurrection of the Dead, the last judgment, the Devil, and demoniacal possessions, &c; and hence it was asked, whether these ideas, since Jesus and his apostles made use of them, were to be considered divinely revealed truths or not? It was no solution, but rather an evasion of these questions, when many Theologians endeavoured to explain away all in the discourses of Jesus and his apostles which they did not wish them to say and teach; an endeavour which for a long time rendered exegesis a display of mere caprice. Nor were the difficulties surmounted, when others maintained that Jesus and his apostles accommodated themselves intentionally to the ideas of those around them; *i. e.* spoke *as if* they had considered the ideas of the Jews correct; for this was too often contradicted by the New Testament, and such accommodation seemed neither necessary nor admissible in an ambassador from God, who came to bring light into darkness.

Thus there remained nothing for Theology but *Critical Supernaturalism*; *i. e.* that mode of reasoning, which holds fast the truth of a supernatural revelation given at successive times through the prophets of the Old Testament and Jesus, and believes the history of it, as they give it in the Bible; but, at the same time, maintains, that the aim of such revelation could only be to awaken, purify, and spread among the nations the religious ideas which were contained in the universal and original Revelation, and to secure their duration, and establish their value by the outward institution of a church. So Nitzsch (1808) regarded the revelation as a divine and miraculous promulgation of religious ideas, established by sacred history, carried forward in the course of time, and intended as the *outwardly* and openly professed word of God, to awaken and confirm the *inward* word

of God. This view has been lately developed most completely by Bretschneider; and Ammon, in his "Fortbildung des Christenthums zur Weltreligion," ("The gradual formation of Christianity as a Religion for the World;") has endeavoured to prove it historically, by the history of the Christian articles of Faith. According to Bretschneider, the following conclusions are to be drawn from it:—The Divine revelation can only extend to the development, purification, protection, and application of the religious ideas in the mind, since all that is not included in these ideas is foreign to religion. Since the development of the religious ideas must inwardly be closely connected with the cultivation of the human mind, and its constantly-extending and improving views of the world, and outwardly is dependent for its increase on the increase of population, and on the civilization and intercourse of nations,—the Revelation can be no other than PROGRESSIVE; subject to this twofold contingency: and the religious ideas could not at first be comprehended by the understanding of Man in their full clearness and purity; but under such forms of transition as the capacity of comprehension of the human mind at that time required.

These forms of transition are, therefore, only for their own times, not for all ages; they rather disappear, as the ideas themselves grow into full purity and clearness. The holy Scriptures contain the history of this progressive development, which, as the history of religion, is at once the proof of the reality of such a development, and sets before us the outward forms by which God has produced and secured the comprehension and extension of religious ideas.

Jesus himself not only exhibited the "Ideal" of a religious Man in his life, by which he was the Son and Image of God, and makes all who resemble him Children of God, but he also completed in his instructions the development of the religious ideas, or prepared them beforehand, both as to compass and contents. But the Form, in which these ideas were clothed by him and his apostles, was, and must have been, temporary; *i. e.* one which was intelligible to the then existing state of civilization and philosophy, and could connect itself with the notions of the age, as the necessary stepping stones, as it were, to a higher degree of knowledge. But the essential and abiding part of Christianity is the pure religious ideas themselves, which were incorporated and made manifest in the person and life of Christ, and have their outward means of promulgation among the nations and influence on the conduct, in the Christian Church. Since this theological view allows an immediate influence of God on the Spirit of Man, finds the history of this influence in the

Bible, acknowledges the fullest measure of it to have fallen on Christ, and Christ to be the person called and prepared by God to be the interpreter of true religion for the whole race of Man, and thus adheres to the "Mystical Element" of Christianity, it is *Supernaturalism.* But since, at the same time, it points out an invariable criterion of what is to be considered Revelation in the Biblical account of Revelation, it is CRITICAL *Supernaturalism.* Since it employs the original, universal Revelation of God, which took place at the creation of the world, as the standard for the succeeding revelations, this standard is not arbitrary, but necessary; not human, but divinely given.

From this mode of Theological reasoning, RATIONALISTIC Theology differs. The distinguishing characteristic of Rationalism is, that it completely renounces the idea of an *immediate* divine enlightenment of the mind of Man; consequently, it lays entirely aside the "Mystical Element;" and that the Reason of Man, awakened to reflection by the contemplation of the world, raises itself by its own power to the knowledge of religious ideas. Rationalism has improperly been supposed the same as NATURALISM, which considers *all* religions, Christianity included, as belonging to Religion, as being researches of the human mind. But Rationalism is Christian, in as far as it acknowledges that God, in his government of the world, so prepared Jesus Christ by distinguished power of mind, and so favoured him by circumstances, that he could, not only himself perceive the universal truths of religion, but, by instruction, and laying the foundation of a Church, he was enabled to spread abroad the knowledge and appreciation of them among the nations.—This view, which was formerly brought forward by Löffler, Henke, Eckermann, &c., has in more recent times found its chief defenders in Röhr and Wegscheider. Its weak side, in a philosophical point of view, is, that it denies all continued immediate influence of God on the human mind, and considers that His direct agency ceased with the primary act of creating the world. In a Theological view, however, it fails, in that the personality of Jesus, as the Son of God, is thrown by it too much into the back ground, and Christ appears chiefly as the Teacher of a system of religion; so that the belief of the truth of his doctrine must rest on the previous supposition that the train of thought, (consisting of Idea, Judgment, and Conclusion,) by which he sought and arrived at Truth, was in all respects perfectly correct, and *did lead* to Truth: a supposition for which there are no adequate grounds in the principles of Rationalism.

Lastly, we have to consider the PHILOSOPHICALLY—ALLEGORIZING, or SYMBOLICAL Theology, which arose from the appli-

cation of the modern systems of Philosophy, to the Theology of the Church. Philosophy and Theology have ever exercised a very strong influence over one another, as indeed it is their nature to do. The Philosophy of Leibnitz and Wolf, which prevailed at the beginning of the 17th century, occasioned the strict, mathematical mode of teaching of Wolf to be carried into Theology also,—accurately defining ideas, and pretending to the strength of demonstration. This mathematical mode of teaching (*methodus demonstrativa,*) was applied to Theology, chiefly by Baumgarten, Carpov, and Reinbeck. Their chief error was, that they believed it possible and necessary to prove everything; *i. e.* to deduce everything from other certain propositions: and that thus they endeavoured to prove what was incapable of demonstration; thereby only rendering it doubtful. In place of this, arose the Philosophy of Kant, which was soon brought to bear on Christian Theology in its full extent, by Stäudlin, Schmidt, Tieftrunk, Ammon, and others. This, completely critical in its nature, made Theology also Critical. Its chief error was, that it only ascribed certainty to one intuitive perception, that of Morality, and would deduce from this primary one all other religious ideas, even that of God; in which, however, the idea of morality is comprised as a component part. But when Kant himself, in his work entitled "Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft," (Religion within the limits of pure Reason), 1793, endeavoured to place the ideas of his philosophical theory of religion under the authorized Theology of the Church, and, to this end, undertook a "Moral Exposition (eine Moralische Auslegung) of the Bible," *i.e.* an interpretation of it in a sense agreeable to his theory, he became the author of the modern *philosophically-allegorizing* Theology, which has been revived still later by Schelling, Hegel, and Schleiermacher. For, however different the systems of these three may be as *Philosophy*, they have this in common,—which most concerns Christian Theology, —that they disclaim the basis of Christianity, viz., Deism, or the distinction of a God, existing independent of the world, and the Thought of Man: and consider the distinction of Self from God, as a delusion which must be given up in a philosophical view. While Schelling identifies the Absolute (the All) with God, which, he says, in Man's consciousness of God, becomes consciousness of Self, and so grows into Personality,— and while Hegel declares the existence and life of the idea of God in the human mind, to be the Existence of God,—both systems are equally opposed to Christian Theology, whose foundation is a belief in a Being distinct from our Thought: and the Christian ideas of the government of the world, a revelation,

prayer to God, and the moral independence of Man, can find no place in either of them.

But it has pleased the authors and friends of these systems, to clothe their speculative positions in formulas of Church Theology; and to justify this by the assertion, that the mind of Man, unknown to itself, went through the terms of Hegel's speculations, and, in forming the dogmas of the Trinity, Original Sin, Atonement, &c., made use, as it were, instinctively, of the propositions of the theory. Thus, as this system, in its fundamental proposition, (That the contradistinction of *Self*, and *God*, in consciousness, must be given up;) has three terms, Self, God, and the Union of both,—they find the essence of their doctrine of God in the Church dogma of the Trinity. The natural distinction of Self from God, which has been called *Egotism*, *i. e.*, the desire of being an Individual,—they find expressed in the Church dogma of the Fall by Sin, as being a falling-away from God. The complete abolition of this opposition, which took place through Jesus, is by them expressed in the dogma of Christ the God-man; and the abolition of the distinction between the would-be-independent *Self* and *God*, by which Individuality must be sacrificed, lies in the dogma of the atoning death of Jesus.—Daub applied Schelling's system, and Marheinecke that of Hegel, to Christian Theology.

The fallacy of Schelling's and Hegel's system is, that they both would pass over the origin of knowledge, *i. e.*, consciousness: and both would require of consciousness-of-self (whose very being depends on the distinction of self and God, without which it is empty words,) the unreasonable and impossible surrender of that distinction. With respect to the application of it to Christian Theology, its inefficiency is shown by the arbitrary manner in which the Church dogmas are expounded in a sense perfectly foreign to them; by the facility with which a Theology not Christian, such as that of the Hindoos, might be also adapted to this system; and by the impossibility of reconciling these speculations with the Christian idea of morality. At all events, no one has hitherto attempted to deduce Christian morality from these principles.

As to Schleiermacher, his system appeared in his "Evangelischen Glaubenslehre," (Evangelical doctrine of Faith,) at once as Christian Theology, and not as Philosophy only.

His principle is, that Religion is the feeling of absolute dependence, but that God *is* Absolute, consequently the feeling of absolute dependence is the consciousness of God, which is the perpetual existence itself of God, appearing in Man in the form of consciousness-of-God. This consciousness of God ought to

be perpetual (" immanentes Bewusstsein"); that is to say, ought to reign pre-eminent and undisturbed, with equal power, every moment of our lives. But this it is not found to do in reality, because carnal feelings interrupt the consciousness of God. But instead of concluding hence, that the demand of a perpetual consciousness of God is false and unnatural, this conflict is considered as Original Sin, from which Man must be delivered. The deliverance consists in this; that Man should no longer consider himself as a bodily Individuality, but as a part of the Being of God, which consists in the existence of God in human consciousness. Such a life was seen in Jesus, who sacrificed his Individuality to God, and thus became the God-man and Deliverer. Again the fallacy of this system is, that it passes over the nature of consciousness, brings forward a completely impracticable demand, and interprets the dogmas of the Church in a sense which they will not admit.

Whilst, however, philosophy exerted her influence more on the elements of Christian and Church dogmas, the other sciences, particularly historical criticism, the natural sciences, and the knowledge of languages and antiquity, were powerful agents in the elucidation and use of the source of all knowledge of Christian Theology; the Holy Scriptures. Not only was the early notion, (as unfounded as it is untenable) of the Inspiration of the Bible, rejected, but close researches were instituted into the authenticity and credibility of its different parts; in consequence of which many of the earlier views of them were entirely reversed.

The science thus formed, and called " Introduction to the Holy Scriptures," was particularly and meritoriously cultivated by Eichhorn, Michaelis, Berthold, De Wette, and others; not to mention the extensive and learned researches into the origin and authenticity of particular biblical writings, such as those of Moses and the Evangelists. Yet more important to Christian Theology was the application of historical criticism to the biblical accounts of past occurrences, in which the endeavours became remarkable,—either to render doubtful the miracles related in the Bible, as by the English, French, and German Freethinkers of the eighteenth century,—or to explain them away in a natural manner, often very clumsily, and by very forced interpretations,—or to represent them as Myths, *i. e.* Popular Traditions, written down at a late period, which had gradually assumed a miraculous clothing. The latter view was brought into notice particularly, in a scientific manner, by Eichhorn, Gabler, Krug, and Bauer. It has been recently carried to its highest pitch by Strauss, in his " Life of Jesus;" and, were it true, would pre-

sent to us a much greater miracle, viz., how, if Jesus were only a common Rabbi, his life could yet have produced so extraordinary an effect on the world as it assuredly has done, according to the facts of history. But the science of Languages and Antiquity first gave fixed rules for the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, as sources of the knowledge of Christian Theology. Until the time of the Reformation, no exegetical Theology existed as a Science, but caprice and allegorical explanation prevailed. The latter was rejected by the Reformers, and they urged the literal sense, though without scientifically defining the principles of interpretation. For the slight inquiries which Karlstadt and afterwards Flacius made on the subject, were soon forgotten amid the fierce conflicts of dogmatism. Indeed the Reformers followed far too often a purely theological explanation, *i.e.* they took the words of the Bible exactly in the sense in which the Church had already dogmatically settled them. J. A. Ernesti, in his "Interpres Novi Test." (Leipzig, 1761,) first laid down the principle that in the explanation of the Bible, the same rules must come into force, which would be used in the explanation of any profane historian; for instance, a regard to the peculiar idioms of the language,—the history and mode of thinking of the times,—parallel passages,—and the context. For the researches into the language of the Old Testament, Michaelis, Eichhorn, Gesenius, Hartmann, and Ewald particularly deserve notice: for those into the language of the New Testament, the modern philological school is meritorious; for instance, Winer, who first laboured at the Grammar of the New Testament; Fritsche, and Schulz; and the lexicographers of the New Testament, Bretschneider and Wahl. On the other hand, the party who again defended the Church Dogmas, renewed the ancient theological interpretation, under the guise of a deeper, or theological meaning of Scripture.

Lastly; As to the second great division of Christian Theology, that of Practical Theology or Morality. We may observe that it has undergone much fewer changes in its essentials, than the theoretical part. For the doctrine of individual duties has remained almost always the same; and only the views of the Moral Condition of Man, Salvation, and the means of attaining thereto, as also the general position from which men have endeavoured to deduce philosophically particular duties, have assumed different forms at different times: the former chiefly according to the principles of the prevailing dogmas, the latter according to the existing philosophy. The Bible contains only separate moral precepts, not a system of morality, at which, indeed, no one arrived until the times of the scholastics.

But the general views of Morality were early disturbed and obscured by Asceticism, which arose out of the false views entertained by the philosophers of the first century of the immorality of natural inclinations, and which was exhibited in the monastic life; and by the disciplinarian laws, the penances and indulgences of the Church: and thus Christian Morality was led into false and narrow-minded paths. This false direction of Morality continued even when it was cultivated scientifically by the scholastics of the twelfth and succeeding centuries,—Petrus Lombardus, Alexander Hales, Thomas Aquinas, and Bonaventura. Nay, it soon merged into a useless dialectic casuistry. In the (Roman) Catholic Church, it was no better, even after the Reformation, for the Mystics and Jesuits both made use of it; the former in support of their fanaticism, the latter of their casuistry; and these even taught a most dangerous system of "Probabilities," and degraded morality into a doctrine of prudence and adroitness. On the other hand, Morality has lately found worthy advocates in the (Roman) Catholic Church, in Wanker, Isenbiehl, Mutschelle, Geishüttner, and others. The Reformers were too deeply engaged in dogmatical and ecclesiastically-political strife to be able to apply their talents to the subject of Morality. Luther and Calvin themselves were too much attached to the representations of Augustine to be able to give to the moral nature of Man its honour due. Melancthon certainly did write in 1550, a work expressly on Christian Ethics; but it was too much after the system of Aristotle, and was soon forgotten. For a long time morality was treated merely as a kind of appendage to Dogmatics, until the Hollander Lambertus Danäus, and the German George Calixt, (1634,) again raised it to a distinct Science, and since that time the field has had many labourers. The works on Christian Morality of Baumgarten, Buddeus, Mosheim, Reinhard, Stäudlin, De Wette, and Ammon, particularly deserve notice. As the Pietists (Andreä, Arndt, Spener, Arnold, and Zinzendorf,) gave it more the narrow-minded direction of the earlier Asceticism, others, on the contrary, followed, in their general views and fundamental principles of Morality, the bent of the philosophical systems which they professed: thus Buddeus, Mosheim, Döderlein, Reinhard, and others followed the eclectic school; Less, Bahrdt, and Michaelis followed Eudæmonism; Stäudlin, Schmid, Ammon, and others, the system of Kant; and De Wette the philosophy of Fries.

## Art. II.—ON THE HOLY PLAYS OR MYSTERIES OF THE MIDDLE AGES, with an account of a Sacred Drama which was performed in the year 1810 at Oberammergau in Upper Bavaria.

Tragedy is defined by Aristotle to be *the representation of solemn and important transactions, conveyed in measured language with rhythm and harmony, by action, and not simple narration, exciting pity or dismay, so as to purify and temper the passions of the human breast.*

Such in the days of this great critic was the office of the buskined Muse—and truly marvellous were its effects. Nothing could exceed the intense interest excited by the representation of the *Eumenides* or the *Agamemnon* of Æschylus, or of the *Œdipus at Colonos* of Sophocles; and it is said by Lucian *, that when the *Andromeda* of Euripides was performed at Abdera under the reign of Lysimachus, the audience went from the Theatre horror-struck, fevered, and, as it were, possessed; and that this mania became a sort of Epidemic throughout the city. The laws of Greek tragedy—so essentially differing from those of the modern Drama—were in strict conformity with Aristotle's definition above-quoted. The Chorus, which in our view constitutes its most distinguishing characteristic, so far from being an adjunct, had been in fact its germ and origin, and ever after continued to give it pith and substance. Through the Chorus, not only was expression stamped upon the forms which imagination bodied forth—but unknown or obscure facts were developed, and utterance was given to the most sublime precepts of morals and philosophy. Unnatural as its introduction would *now* appear, it was unquestionably suited to the genius and circumstances of the people among whom it originated—and in the course of this memoir, an example will be given of its advantageous introduction even in our own days. After the death of the great Athenian Triumvirate, the dramatic performances of Greece continued to be conducted upon the same model; and the Romans in succeeding ages—though not inheriting the genius, adopted the technical rules and arrangements of their great Masters. The only Latin tragedies that have descended entire to our times are those which go under the name of Seneca—and in them is exhibited the same general plan which had been adopted by the writers of Athenian tragedy. After the division and decline of

* Lucian—Quomodo historia conscribenda sit.

the Roman Empire, the Greek drama continued to flourish in Byzantium, the Eastern Capital; but in the fourth century Gregory Nazianzen, a father of the Christian Church, was mainly instrumental in banishing Pagan Plays, and introducing upon the stage Sacred Dramas constructed upon the same model, but having their subjects selected from the Old and New Testament. One tragedy, "the passion of Christ," (Χριστος πασχων) remains out of many composed by him; and its Prologue sets forth that the Virgin Mary was therein for the first time introduced upon the stage, and that the piece was got up in imitation of Euripides. At this period indeed, it became customary to compose Christian imitations or parodies of the Greek classics in various departments of the Belles Lettres, to be read and taught in schools—and this fashion began to prevail in Italy. But the genius of Italy, obscured by barbarian ignorance and oppression, emitted for many ages no cheering gleam of light. The Church became the only depository of learning. *There*, on solemn festivals, were performed a species of dramatic exhibition called "Mysteries," or "Miracles," representing the most important passages in the Old and New Testament, and in the lives of the saints. At first they appear to have been little more than Dumb Shows, enlivened with a few short Speeches, and addressed by way of explanation to the unlearned auditors; but afterwards they were enlarged into the form of Dialogue, when some division took place into Acts and Scenes. In the hands of the Priests, however, the buskined Muse appeared to little advantage, being tricked out at one time for purposes of deception, at another of extortion. Scriptural representations, which should have inspired dutiful reverence to God, and gratitude to the Redeemer, were accompanied in many instances with frivolity and gross obscenities, and thus became productive only of contempt and ridicule. In proof of this, the following extract shall be taken from an ancient Novel, often quoted by our old dramatic Poets, entitled "A Merye Jest of a man that was called Howleglas," being a translation from the Dutch language, in which he is named Ulenspiegle.* Howleglas, whose waggish tricks are the subject of this book, after many adventures, comes to live with a priest, who makes him his Parish clerk. This priest is described as keeping a leman or concubine, who had but one eye, to whom Howleglas owed a grudge for revealing his rogueries to his Master. The story thus proceeds:—

> And than in the meane season, while Howleglas was parysh clarke, at

* Imprinted by Wm. Copland; without date, in 4to. bl. let. among Mr. Garrick's Old Plays, vol. x.

Easter they should play 'the Resurrection of our Lorde;' and for because than the men wer not learned, nor could not read, the priest took his leman, and put her in the grave for an Aungell; and this seeing Howleglas, toke to hym three of the symplest persons that were in the town, that played the iij Maries and the person (i. e. Parson or Rector) played Christe, with a baner in his hand. Than said Howleglas to the symple persons, Whan the Aungel asketh you, whome you seke, you may saye, '*the parson's leman withe one iye.*' Than it fortuned that the tyme was come that they must playe, and the Aungel asked them whom they sought, and than say'd they, 'We seke the priest's leman with one iye.' And than the priest might heare that he was mocked. And whan the prieste's leman heard that, she arose out of the grave and would have smyten with her fist Howleglas upon the Cheke,—but she missed him, and smote one of the symple persons that played one of the thre Maries; and he gave her another, and than toke she him by the heare (hair); and that seeing his wyfe, came running hastely to smite the prieste's leman, and than the priest seeing this, caste down his baner, and went to helf his woman, so that one gave the other sore strokes, and made great noise in the Churche. And then Howleglas seying them lyinge together by the eares in the bodi of the Churche went his way out of the village and came no more there."

Considered as literary performances, these plays were beneath Criticism, being very rarely moulded upon the Greek model, but upon the capricious and false taste of every ignorant Monk who might choose to try his hand at this sort of Composition. Besides these, which (as already mentioned) were denominated "Mysteries," other dramatic pieces were brought forward by the same parties, styled "Moralities," or moral plays, wherein allegorical personages were introduced, such as Death, Sin, Good-deeds, Discretion, &c., requiring more skill and invention. Several instances are on record of the performance of both sorts in our own country during the 12th, 13th, 14th and 15th centuries; and of these perhaps the most remarkable are the "Chester Mysteries," composed by Randle Higgenett or Higden (not the compiler of the Polychronicon), a monk of the Abbey there, who lived in the 13th century.* They were first enacted at that City in the year 1328, according to one account, and according to another in 1339, at the expense of the different Guilds or trading Companies. The "fall of Lucifer" was got up by the Tanners—"the Creation" by the Drapers—"the Deluge" by the Dyers, &c.; and from the New Testament, "Christ's passion" by the Bowyers, Fletchers and Ironmongers—the "Descent into Hell" by the Cooks and Innkeepers—the "Resurrection" by the Skinners—and

* Harleian MSS. in the British Museum, Nos. 1948, 2013, 2057, 2124; and Ormerod's Cheshire, vol. i. p. 298.

the "Ascension" by the Taylors. They took place during Whitsun-week, and were continued until the year 1574, Clement, one of the Popes, having granted a pardon of 1,000 days to all persons resorting peaceably to them, to which 40 days were added by the Bishop of the diocese. Sentence of damnation was likewise pronounced against all who interrupted these performances. It is true that our illustrious countryman Roscoe asserts * that these Interludes, which have been preserved among the Harleian manuscripts, have been *antedated* by nearly two centuries. In support however of this assertion no authority is adduced by him, and the evidence more recently brought forward by Mr. Ormerod†, in establishing the date above mentioned, proves that the English were not in this respect behind Italy or any other country of Europe.

It has been already mentioned that these performances were replete with improprieties, to which was added the frequent use of ridiculous and overstrained types drawn from the Old Testament, and exhibited by action and scenery, in order to illustrate to an unlearned audience the life and actions of our Saviour and his disciples. Most Christian Sects have in all ages laid great stress upon the doctrine of Scripture types, and have not limited themselves to such persons or things recorded in the Old Testament as were expressly declared by Christ or his Apostles to have been designed as *prefigurations* of persons or things relating to the New Testament. Many writers have thus given the most unbounded license to the exuberance of their fancy, and strangely twisted the meaning of passages in the Old Testament, to adapt them to their own peculiar views or Dogmas. Thus Cardinal Bellarmine, the great Controversial antagonist of the Protestants, asserts that the Mass is typified in Melchizidec bringing forth bread and wine—he being a priest of the most high God. The Cardinal likewise declares, that the secession of the Protestants, under Luther, was typified by the secession of the ten tribes of Israel under Jeroboam; while the Lutherans with equal reason asserted that Jeroboam was a type of the Pope, and that the secession of Israel from Judah foreshadowed not the secession of the Protestants under Luther—but *that* of the Church of Rome from Primitive Christianity.

Though not possessed of the learning and acuteness of these Controversialists, the parties who enacted the Holy Plays contrived to interweave the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament in such a manner as to amuse if not to edify their audience.

* Life of Lorenzo de' Medici, vol. i. p. 299. 4to.
† History of Cheshire, *supra*.

Notwithstanding they appear to have considered *the whole* of the Old Testament as a *prefiguration* of the Christian dispensation, they were not contented without occasionally enlisting additional recruits from the Apocryphal writers and even from profane authors—all of whom might easily pass muster during so unenlightened a period. A very good illustration of this is presented in the "*Speculum humanæ salvationis*," the most remarkable among that class of Works denominated *Books of Images* or Block books, which preceded the invention of printing, and supposed to have been executed about the year 1440. This book is composed upon the plan of presenting, in consecutive portions of each chapter—first the Antitype, being some event in the history of Christ, and then three types from the Old Testament, &c. —a wood engraving of each being given, followed by an explanation in Leonine or rhyming Latin verses, cut likewise in the wood. Two examples taken promiscuously shall be given. The Nativity of our Saviour is shadowed forth by the three following types: 1st, the dream of Pharoah's butler; 2nd, the rod of Aaron, which budded; 3rd, the Sybil pointing out to Augustus Cæsar in Rome, at the moment of our Saviour's birth, a bright Circle in the Sky, wherein was seated the blessed Virgin with the Infant in her lap; this last being given on the authority of Peter the Lombard. The other example presents us with Christ suspended on the Cross, typified, 1st, by Nebuchadnezar's Dream; 2nd, by King Codrus devoting himself to death for the deliverances of his countrymen the Athenians; and 3rd, by Eleazar meeting with his own death by reason of the Elephant, which he had stabbed, falling upon him. In this case the second type is of course borrowed from the Greek historians, and the last from the Apocryphal book of Maccabees.

On the revival of letters at the beginning of the 16th century, the performance of Holy Plays began to be superseded in Italy by Dramatic productions formed upon the old Grecian model, which called into action not merely the patronage, but even the pen of Lorenzo the magnificent.* These were followed by more elaborate compositions, the Virginia of Accolti, the Sophonisba of Trissino,† the Rosmunda of Rucellai, the Torismondo of Tasso, and the sacrificed Abraham of Beza; and our own Island was able to boast of still more classical productions, the Jeptha and John Baptist of Buchanan in Latin, and the Sampson Agonistes of Milton in English. But the genius and taste of the ultramontane nations became subjected to new impulses. The play wri-

* Roscoe's Lorenzo de' Medici, vol. 1. p. 300, 4th edit.

† In the Sophonisba of Trissino was introduced for the first time the blank verse or Versi sciolti of the Italian language.

ters of Spain and France disdained the trammels which had been imposed by the severe laws of the Athenian drama; and their example was followed in our own country by one who for the absence of *the Unities* has repaid us fifty-fold by the coruscations of his sublime imagination, and by his accurate transcripts of human sympathies and passions. Among the few pieces which have been constructed in more modern times after the Greek, it must be acknowledged that the "Elfrida" and the "Caractacus" of Mason are truly classical. In some of the Roman Catholic countries attempts have occasionally been made to revive the *Mysteries* and *Moralities*, but by the Protestant nations of Europe they have long been altogether discarded. In our own country the famous John Bale appears to have been the last writer of these Holy Plays. Before his conversion from Popery he composed many Scriptural Interludes, chiefly from incidents of the New Testament, such as "The resurrection of Lazarus," "St. John the Baptist," "Simon the leper," &c. &c. After he had received from Edward the Sixth the protestant Bishoprick of Ossory, he is said to have caused two or three of them to be performed at the market Cross of Kilkenny on a Sunday, and he employed his dramatic talents (such as they were,) in the promotion of the *new doctrine*. A play of his called "Kynge Johan" has been lately printed by the "Cambden Society," in which the avowed object was to confirm the Reformation and to put down Popery with its "Latyne horors and popetly playes." A similar object had been aimed at, by the writer of a piece entitled "New Custome," given in the 1st volume of Dodsley's collection of Old Plays. In several of these old English pieces a Chorus formed a regular part of the Drama, and sometimes each act was introduced by what was called "a Domme Shew," designed to prefigure or epitomise the moral to be deduced from what was to follow.

In a remote part of Europe however (Upper Bavaria) a most interesting sacred Drama has been exhibited at intervals during the last two hundred years, which, though constructed for the most part after the Grecian model, is likewise accompanied with many of the more pleasing features of the *Holy Plays*. The decennial period of its representation having again come round, some friends of the writer proceeded on Sunday the 26th of July last from Partenkirk to Oberammergau, about half way between Munich and Inspruck, for the purpose of witnessing it. In their toilsome ascent through this mountainous and romantic district they were accompanied by some few of the better classes, and by very many of the fine Tyrolese and Bavarian peasantry, decked in their gayest attire, and intent upon the like errand. Hundreds

were known to have come from an immense distance—from all parts of Switzerland and from the confines of Italy. Many of the young men from the Tyrol wore upon their pointed hats the rare and beautiful feathers given as prizes at the rifle-contests for which this people is so celebrated. Of these peasants about six thousand, as it afterwards appeared, were collected from the surrounding country. The origin of the exhibition is as follows: in the year 1633 there raged in this part of Bavaria a disorder so fatal and so contagious, that notwithstanding the inhabitants used every precaution, few remained alive. At this season of dismay the little commune of Ammerthal implored help from the Almighty; and made a solemn vow to represent publicly every tenth year the *Passion of Jesus the Saviour of the World,* as an edifying spectacle and a testimonial of gratitude and adoration.* A total cessation of the disorder was the reward of this vow, which was religiously observed by the performance of the piece in the following year (1634), and statedly from that period to the present. In each of these years the whole is repeated ten times during the summer months, the performance commencing (at least on this last occasion) at nine o' clock, and lasting until five or six in the evening, with the interval of one hour for dinner. The language of the piece was German, interlarded however with provincialisms. The admission was by ticket, and the proceeds are applied to the repair or rebuilding of such cottages as may have been injured by avalanches. The Title of the piece is as follows: "*The great Offering of Reconciliation at Golgotha, or the History of the passion and death of Jesus, according to the four Evangelists, with types or figures from the Old Testament, to be performed for admiration and edification,*" &c. &c. *Music by Dedler.*"

In resemblance of the primitive theatres of Greece, the place of representation was an enclosure surrounded with rough railing, but open to the sky, with the exception of one small shed for invalids; and the interest of the whole spectacle was greatly enhanced by the romantic grandeur of the surrounding Alps, towering on all sides, but especially towards the South, over the valley. The stage occupied a large space, and was disposed in a great measure after the Greek fashion. The number of performers must have exceeded in the whole, three hundred. They were divided into three classes: 1st, Those who carried on the ordinary dialogue of the tragedy; 2nd, the chorus; and 3rd, the persons who represented in dumb show, or what may be

* The Classical reader will recollect that the dramatic entertainments (Ludi scenici) of the Romans had their origin, A. U. C. 391, in a vow made to appease the wrath of the Gods on occasion of a great pestilence.

called, *tableaux vivants*, the various types which were drawn from the Old Testament for the purpose of illustrating each successive scene in the tragedy. The chorus, which in Greek tragedy was composed of fifteen persons, here consisted of eleven, four men and seven women or girls, all attired in white vests or togas, with velvet flowing robes suspended from their shoulders, their heads being surmounted with large feathers of various colours. One of them, as in the old Greek Chorus, sustained the office of coryphæus or leader, offering moral reflections or explanations to the audience, and chanting them in recitative, or in unison with some or all of his followers. They were accompanied by a musical band, placed below the stage, in which a lusty priest seemed to take a prominent share. But whereas on the Greek theatre, the Chorus frequently performed the part of an actor, singing or declaiming with the persons of the drama, in the present case it entered into no dialogue whatever, but was confined to the moralising upon and explaining the the above-mentioned *tableaux*, in their relation to the events or antitypes in our Saviour's life and passion, and it withdrew altogether while these last were represented.

The interlocutors in the sacred drama, and the persons who enacted the *tableaux* from the Old Testament, had been judiciously selected, and performed their parts well. The former employed much action and intonation. Our Saviour was personated by a fine looking young man, (a glover by trade,) who greatly resembled the portraits given of him by Leonardo da Vinci, while the part of his mother Mary was performed by a very handsome woman, who reminded the spectators of Vandyke's heads of the blessed Virgin. Mary Magdalen appeared as an ungainly personage, awkwardly wiping the feet of Jesus with her superabundant tresses. One or two passages were even calculated to excite laughter, as when the crowing of the cock was imitated, at the time of Peter's denial of his Master, and when repentant Judas flings the thirty pieces of silver with a heavy bang at the head of the chief of the Sanhedrim. But the general performance was effective, and produced a great impression, some of the spectators being so much overcome with grief, as to feel themselves compelled to retire. From the construction of the stage, little change of scenery was practicable. Such scenes however as were exhibited, appeared correct; and with regard to the *tableaux*, the attitudes and entire grouping of them were really natural, and in good keeping, and the dresses were appropriate.

After singing a brief prologue, the Chorus divided, six taking one side, and five the other. The curtain was drawn up, and a *tableau vivant* was exhibited, representing Abraham prepared to

offer up his only son Isaac at Mount Moriah, upon which, as foreshadowing the self-immolation of our Saviour, the leader made some pious and pertinent reflections. The drama then properly commenced. It was divided into four acts, the first comprising the time between Christ's entry into Jerusalem, and his being taken in the Mount of Olives; the second from the taking of our Saviour, until his crucifixion; the third exhibiting Christ's passion and death; and the fourth, his resurrection. These acts were subdivided into many scenes, wherein the dialogue was carried on in prose, and every scene was introduced by the exhibition of one, two or three types, as already described, each type or *tableau* being explained or commented upon in Lyric verse by the Chorus. The following is translated by way of specimen from the third act, the scene from the New Testament being intended to represent "Christ taken before Caiaphas, accused by false witnesses, declared guilty, and maltreated by the servants of the High Priest."

1st *Tableau.*—The innocent Naboth is condemned to death by means of false witnesses.

(Chorus sings.)

Jesus, the spotless and the pure,
Torture and scorn must now endure.
Betray'd, revil'd—must meet his fate,
Prepared by unrelenting hate.
For us, the crown of thorns he wears,
For us, alas! the cross he bears.
Type of our Lord, in days of yore,
Thus cruel sufferings Naboth bore.
At once his life and vineyard fell
A prey to treacherous Jezebel.
In guiltless Naboth's history,
A picture of the world we see.
Wolves lurk in ambush on the way,
To make defenceless lambs their prey.
O then! ye Princes, learn to fear
The King of kings who placed you here.
By his impartial hand in vain
Injustice would unscath'd remain.
The rich and poor, God views with equal eye,
Their deeds of mercy, or their cruelty.

2nd *Tableau.*—Job afflicted—taunted by his wife and friends.

(Chorus sings.)

The righteous man of Uz behold,
For patience long renown'd!
He, prospering once, in wealth untold,
Now poor and sick is found.

His substance gone—his children dead,
In ashes all forlorn :
He sits, assailed by wife and friends,
With ridicule and scorn.

Wasted his flesh and parched his skin,
Sharp pains attack his life.
Scarce can the vital soul within
Maintain th' unequal strife.

But lo ! a sacred type he stands,
Foreshadowing Christ our Lord ;
Who much endured at sinners' hands,
And died to save a world.

Deserted at his utmost need,
No place to lay his head ;
By perjured miscreants doomed to bleed,
A Lamb to slaughter led.

Christians ! to gushing tears give vent,
Give utterance to your sighs ;
His fate demands your loud lament,
Your warmest sympathies.

A long time was occupied in the performance of this third act, all the circumstances immediately preceding and accompanying Christ's passion being minutely detailed. The awful event of the crucifixion was shown forth in frightful verisimilitude. The living actor appeared suspended on a cross between two thieves, his limbs writhing in agony, his feet and hands transfixed and streaming with gore. A soldier advancing, pierced his side, and the spear being withdrawn, was followed by a gush of blood. The head of the Redeemer began to droop, his eyes were closed, and he meekly gave up the ghost. Then followed the earthquake and other portents recorded in Holy Writ. The taking down of the body was most touching, and presented a group precisely such as Rubens has depicted in his celebrated painting at Antwerp. The nails were extracted from the stiffened limbs, and the agonized friends of Jesus were seen hanging over his corpse, and freely giving vent to their bitter sorrowings and despair. This act finished with the interment of the body, and the watching at the grave.

The fourth and last act opened with the *tableau* or type of Jonah safely delivered from the whale's belly, followed by that of the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, both being intended to foreshadow the resurrection and ascension of Christ, which were accurately represented.

The whole piece was brought to a conclusion amidst the loud Hallelujahs of the full Chorus.

During the entire performance, the immense audience remained rivetted in mute attention, saving that in the more touching passages, stifled sighs were at intervals heard, while tears were observed to steal down the cheeks of many a hardy mountaineer. Thus without the incongruities of the *old moralities,* or the formal precision of the Greek drama, the sympathies of the human heart were touched in a degree never surpassed by the Athenian tragedians, or by any who have followed them.

At the conclusion, before which no one had offered to depart, excepting such as were overcome with grief, interesting groups of peasants were seen taking leave of one another, and engaging themselves, by the blessing of God, to meet once more at the next decennial representation. Each set out for his distant home, full of pious gratitude to a suffering Redeemer, and humbly trusting that he had that day advanced, in his own imperfect measure, in learning *how to live,* and *how to die.*

## Art. III.—THE HERESY OF A HUMAN PRIESTHOOD TRACED IN LETTERS ON THE PRESENT STATE OF THE VISIBLE CHURCH OF CHRIST. By R. M. Beverley.

Mr. Beverley will be remembered by many of our readers as the author of several very striking and popular pamphlets on the state of the Church of England and the Universities. He is marked, as we think, by a strong tendency to exaggeration, and by a disposition to take symptoms of a probable, for proofs of an actual state of things; and, again, proofs of an actual, though limited state of things, for symptoms of a general. He possesses an eye keenly alive to the signs of any danger which he suspects, and in reading his publications we must put down a great deal to fear and imagination, which would otherwise appear to be the result of observation and experience. In the Letters before us, with much that is both true and valuable, there are abundant indications of these peculiar qualities. Take for example the following strange confession—we were very near writing,—assertion :—"I never yet was fortunate enough to hear a sermon, whether in Church or Chapel, on the important topic of the love of the brethren; nor have I been able, by diligent search, to find a published discourse on the subject; so that, apparently, no doctrine has of late years been so much neglected."—Letter XIX. The process in Mr. Beverley's mind here, as in many other passages of his Letters, is this: he thinks, and very justly, that brotherly love is one of the first Christian duties; he fears, and probably with some cause, that it is not as much or as frequently insisted upon as it ought to be, and then pens the sentence which we have just quoted, leaving the impression that apparently the subject of Love to the Brethren has slipped out of the memory and the consciousness of the whole Church of Christ. We are thus too frequently obliged to say in reference to Mr. Beverley's statements—"very alarming—if correct." Not that we in the slightest degree impugn his veracity, but that we think his fear is too often father to his thought, and that in unconscious compliance with this fear, he puts up with too limited an induction of facts. Mr. Beverley's province in the religious world is that of an alarmist, and his slashing style would be shorn woefully of its glory and of its effect, if he were to admit into it too freely the spirit of palliation, or a disposition to account, on less melancholy grounds, for the phenomena which he describes. Nevertheless there is truth, very

much truth, scattered up and down these Letters, which Christians of all denominations may read with profit. They are however chiefly directed, as the title shows, against the continued existence in the Christian Church of a Priesthood, whether under the name of Clergy or Ministry. And accordingly the author bears down as hardly upon the Dissenters and their pastors, as upon the Establishment and its Priests. He says,—

"We must show, first, that believers have a close access to God; second, in the Christian body there is no gradation in the privilege of proximity, so that one portion of believers may approach nearer to God than their brethren. If the first point can be proved, then it will be established that the faithful are priests, because a close access to God is the whole object of a priesthood: the sacerdotal office has no other design, than, by an allowed proximity to the Divinity, to exercise functions, and enjoy privileges of communion, in which others may not participate."—Letters, p. 23.

And these points, as may be supposed, at least by Protestants, the author has no difficulty in proving. His objection seems to affect only the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and the Romish part of the Church of England. But he himself thinks that it affects Protestants, and Protestant Dissenters even. He thinks that the system adopted among them countenances the idea that the minister is nearer the mercy-seat than those whose devotions he leads—that he is offering prayer for them.

"The truth nevertheless," he says, "must be plainly stated, that the established order of worship in the dissenting churches is not scriptural; a plurality of ministers is not there tolerated; the brethren who may have the gift, are neither desired nor allowed to address the Church; the whole task of instruction is consigned to one individual, regularly educated and salaried for the work, and no attempt is made to encourage the expression of that spiritual condition, which assuredly is possessed by many a pious dissenter, who, through the instructions of divine grace, has hived up a store of profitable doctrine and wholesome experience, but which he carries with him to the grave, locked and sealed up in his own bosom, unknown and unappreciated by his brethren, because it has been the traditional etiquette of the Sect, that the lips of one priest alone should 'keep knowledge,' and that 'the people should seek the law at his mouth.'"—p. 27.

Again—

"Great and numerous are the duties expected of a minister, and large are the ideas entertained of the limits of his office: and yet if he does not fill up the complement of all the impossible toil imposed upon him, he too often falls into discredit with his people, for not doing that which cannot be done. The study and preparation expected for the pulpit; the pastoral visits; the attention to the spiritual cases of particular indivi-

duals; the schools; the prayer meetings; the Church meetings; the public meetings; and all the rest of the complicated machinery of operative religion, impose a weight and multiplicity of cares on the shoulders of some pastors, which none but Atlantean shoulders could sustain; and yet if the minister neglects any part of these enormous duties, which a mistaken theory has apportioned to him, he is in jeopardy of forfeiting the esteem of some of his flock, as he too often discovers, to his no small discomfort and sorrow. To use a curious expression of a deep thinker, 'he is a system and not a man;' circumstances have given him a character which rightly belongs to a society and not to an individual; but neither he nor the Church understands the difficulty of the case, the hidden cause of the difficulty, nor its only possible remedy. The theory of the parish-priest perplexes the views, and confuses the judgments both of pastor and people, and as each party argues on an erroneous axiom, it is no wonder that the deduction of each should be faulty. The people too often think their pastor careless and inattentive; the pastor not unfrequently considers his people unjust and unreasonable."—Letters, p. 30.

These two passages contain the gist at once of the doctrine and the argument which Mr. Beverley advances: perhaps there never was a time in the religious history of our country when they were advanced with less chance of producing any effect. All denominations seem to be most resolutely pressing on exactly in the direction which the author deprecates; and they have no doubt their own reasons for it. The Church insists with freshened zeal on the necessity and sanctity of holy orders; and rudely denies all fellowship with those pretenders to clerisy who possess not the true "virus." The old English Presbyterians cling as tenaciously as ever to the necessity of a class of men educated expressly for the purpose of the ministry. The Congregationalists or Independents have more of this distinction now than they ever had. More colleges are established among them, and the so-called laity take less and less part in their public religious services. The Methodists, it is notorious, now that they are being elevated into wealth, and comparative mental culture themselves, are demanding an educated ministry, and founding colleges.

The Friends are perhaps the only considerable body of any long standing, who apparently do not fall into the line of this march; but they are fast breaking up, partly from lack of this very thing, and they, it must be remembered, have virtually a ministry as much as any other sect: for it is a standing custom with them, that any aspirant to the office of "minister," must be approved by a committee or other authorized body, before he can be allowed to be a regular preacher in their meetings; and a society of Friends has its one, two, three, or four recognized

"ministers," as much as any other dissenting society has its one or two.

We feel persuaded, therefore, that Mr. Beverley's book is but a pellet flung against the irresistible progress of the social stream. Nevertheless, as it has had a large secret circulation, has encountered a good deal of dislike among those for whose benefit it was especially designed, as it contains some criticisms that may be useful to all parties, and some information that will be particularly acceptable to our own readers, we have felt anxious to bring it under consideration.

In the principle of the "Letters" we cordially agree. There is no distinction in the Church of Christ, such as is sometimes implied in the expressions, "lay" and "clerical." The distinction is entirely one of expediency and convenience. This is our only ground of difference with the Author. That all "have equal access to God," and that there is no real and necessary religious distinction between "priest" and "people," we maintain as firmly and as eagerly as he does. But he further asserts, that the devotion of a few men more particularly to the office of Religious Instructors, the allotment of a particular kind of education to them, and the securing of them from contact with the common cares of business, by appointing them some other means of support, are moreover inexpedient. We heartily wish that we could think so too. For the assembling of a society together, in which the words of prayer, and the music of praise, the lessons of wisdom and of truth, could be mutually imparted and received with propriety and advantage to all—instead of having one man to talk, and all the rest to listen, would be a sight cheering to all good men. But, unless Churches were under the immediate guidance of the Spirit, that this would be the result, we much question. Let us ask Mr. Beverley, who he thinks (setting aside all those whose profession and duty render it imperative) would be most likely, if all were free to speak in a Church, to address the assembled brethren? Would it be usually the most modest, the best-informed, the most serious, and the most thoughtful? or would it be the most confident and vain, the most self-satisfied and ignorant?

Suppose it should be allowed, as is found to be requisite even among the Quakers, that not everybody that would should be permitted to speak, but only such as were thought competent and qualified by their brethren. Then we have got a virtual ministry, or priesthood. If there be no limitation or selection of the speakers, there is a certainty of a plentiful admixture of ignorance and offensive presumption in the Church-meetings, and a probability of debate, dispute, and recrimination; and, if

there be a limitation and selection, then you have order and propriety indeed, but at the expense of an authorized ministry, or clergy. We believe that our author would incline to the latter alternative, though he would not admit our inference; for though he likes the idea of a Church where every brother may have his gift, and communicate it, he still seems practically to be content with insisting upon a "plurality" of ministers.

Let us suppose ourselves, then, in possession of our select band of preachers, constituted from the ablest, the best-informed, the most pious and virtuous members of the Church. We frankly confess that there is to us an indescribable charm in the very contemplation of such a thing. Especially if these brethren apportioned their respective departments according to their respective gifts; conscientiously devoted much of their time to the pursuit of religious knowledge, and the cultivation of devotional habits; kept themselves unspotted from the world; were able each week to look around them and say in their hearts' depths with the Apostle, "receive us, we have wronged no man, we have defrauded no man, we have deceived no man." By this arrangement, and by the co-operation which would be yielded to each of the elders in his own department by the other members of the Church, would be avoided that state of things which is but too justly deplored in the Letters as frequently existing among us now.

"The tendency of the actual arrangement (*i. e.* of one minister) is, of necessity, to create inactivity amongst the people, when they feel that they have a spiritual delegate, in whose hands are placed those large and responsible duties which are supposed to attach to the ministerial office. Many there are, who can thus find a ready excuse for their own lack of zeal; they think their Pastor carries the keys of the church, and to him therefore they consign their spiritual energies, as if he were a general proxy for all the people in their works of faith and labours of love. What multitudes of Church members might be numbered, who take no personal interest in the operations of the Church! How many there are who content themselves with the external acts of worship and a formal attendance on ordinances, leaving all the rest to the minister, or to any one that chooses to undertake that which they will not touch with one of their little fingers."—p. 30.

Feeling the beauty of the results which would flow from such a combined spiritual machinery in Christian Societies, could it be kept in pure and active operation, we state our impression of the difficulty of its attainment with sincere and unfeigned regret. Could it be put into execution, many are the minds and hearts that would rejoice in the alleviation of the responsibility and con-

sequent anxiety which it would bring, and many the hands that would be upraised with joy, as though at the real coming of the Lord amongst us. But we observe the tendency so strongly in Christian societies to condemn what is only on a par with themselves ; to look for something purer in its code, and higher in its illustration of that code; more extended in its knowledge, and more comprehensive in its spirit, than what is prevalent among themselves; we observe so few men, to whose united piety, benignity, intelligence, knowledge, and (as we must add) powers of language and general views, all would yield the tribute of sufficient respect, that we fear that what we know, as a matter of history, to have hitherto commonly been, as a matter of expectation, we must regard as likely to be, namely, that as men themselves grow in mental and moral culture, they demand persons who shall have the peculiar knowledge and the peculiar powers requisite to present religious Truths in a varied and yet a commanding and attractive form, and they find that minds engaged in the harrassing cares of the world, fresh from the barterings and bickerings of a business life, with no peculiar preparation either of discipline or of study for the work, are not best fitted, as the weekly returning day of solemn thought comes back, to impress them with the elevated view of truth, or the pure, unsullied, and extended view of Christian duty which they want to have restored within them. They feel therefore anxious, for the very solemnizing of their spirits, and progress of their characters, that at any rate one of their number shall have time and opportunity secured him to study and aptly to enforce the great truths of religion ; that he shall come among them with the message of Christ fresh written in his heart, with its traces obliterated, we say not, by no cares, (for these may often but tend to deepen them,) but by no unworthy cares, no heart filled with the dread, and yet at times degrading, anxieties of a changing world, no disputes or differences with fellow-worshippers and fellow-men. That he shall come among them as from an etherial atmosphere, in which he has been breathing since they met before; from that converse with his Master, and that converse with his God; from that sharing in their cares and sorrows, their joys and gladnesses ; from that kneeling by the sick-bed, that rite of welcome to the newly-born, or that rite of parting to the newly-dead, all of which are the natural duties of the Christian Minister. That he shall come, a spiritual being, to them spiritual beings; a child of earth to them children of earth ; that he shall be able to look around on all, with heart of peace and eye of kindness, and feel not the trace of a single jealousy or heart-burning in his breast. We venture to say, and we say it sadly and unwillingly, that it

is only a ministry educated for its own sweet and solemn purposes, that it is only a ministry separated by the independent provision made for its necessary wants from the carking cares of this nether struggling world, from whom, in any *numbers*, these things can be expected. Heaven forbid that we should speak thus as prophets of the future—we speak as commentators on the past—we speak the voice these very societies and assemblies of men have themselves by their deeds proclaimed. Would that it were *not* so, would that the time might come, when it should be so no more. But the further religious societies advance in knowledge and general cultivation, the less disposed are persons, not specially qualified for the task both by leisure and education, to undertake the duties of public Religious Instructors, and the less likely are the members of the societies themselves to be content with their ministrations. Mr. Beverley indeed instances the case of the early Christians—and we might add that of the early Methodists. But why did this state of things so soon cease among the Christians? why is it gradually ceasing among the Methodists? For the reasons already mentioned. Besides, according to Mr. Beverley's views, there was inspiration among the early Christians. They therefore needed not the time and preparation that are needed now, and the cases therefore are not analogous.

But the main difficulty in the way of a plurality of ministers, all following their own worldly vocations, is, as we have indicated, and as Mr. Beverley asserts, the growth of refinement, education, and knowledge among Christian Societies. This is the obstacle which Mr. Beverley feels to be fatal to his plans and wishes. And (will it be believed) he therefore vigorously applies himself to decry and lament this as a dreadful evil! He openly declares his aversion to the progress of intellectual acumen and attainment. He hates the name of "study"—cannot endure the idea of theological research. He would allow of a knowledge of Latin and Greek to his Preacher—but any learning beyond this he would forbid. Such expressions and indications of more recondite lore, as "primary meanings, orientalisms, historical allusions, mythic phraseology, figurative expressions, allegorical types, poetical ornaments, grammatical constructions, *usus loquendi*," shoot like a flight of arrows into his brain. We shall not try the patience of our readers by gravely discussing with the Author the question of the advantage or disadvantage of learning (that is, be it remembered, *knowledge*, though only of a particular kind) to the Preachers of Christianity, and the Investigators of Truth, but quote some of those passages from the Letters which give cheering signs of the progress both of opinion and learning among the Independent Congregationalists.

*Extract from the Pastoral charge at an ordination.*

"Science and Literature are now so widely diffused, even over the middling classes, that no small measure of information is requisite to enable a minister to converse with his own flock; *unless therefore you intend to devote eight hours a-day to your studies,* I have no expectation that you will long retain this pulpit. To secure such a portion of time as this, it will be necessary to guard against that temptation to neglect the study, with which a ministerial station in this mighty city must ever be attended."—Letters, p. 53.

*Symptoms of Progress.*

"It has been my lot to hear orthodox non-conformists deliver sermons, such as, I should have supposed, could have been heard only in Socinian chapels; for though they did not attack the *foundations*, nor assert anything contrary to sound faith, yet so entirely did they omit the gospel, or any allusion to any one of its doctrines, that a Mahommedan or a Jew might have listened with pleasure to the whole discourse, without wincing at one word, except the formulary at the end. The language was excellent, the thoughts were vigorous, the delivery animated, the action just and graceful, the manner energetic and decorously impassioned, forming a *tout ensemble* which commanded attention, and secured unabated interest: but alas! not one word was uttered, by which one could guess that the preacher was of the Christian" (in Mr. Beverley's sense) "persuasion. The discourse on one particular occasion was on prayer; and yet, in a long sermon on this vital subject, every thing was said almost that could be said, excepting the truths revealed in the gospel; the throne of grace; the great High Priest; the only approach to God through his righteousness and intercession; and the angel to whom has been given much incense, 'that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints, upon the golden altar which is before the throne!' All this was passed by; the celebrated preacher was discoursing of the God of nature, the God of the natural man, 'Jehovah, Jove, or Lord;' and a Guru from the banks of the Ganges, or a Mullah from the mosque of Mecca, might have said amen to this Christian Sermon!"—Letters, p. 55.

The following comparison between the learning of the Established, and that of the Dissenting Ministry, is ably drawn, and is extremely just.

"From all that has been already urged, it must be anticipated, that I am to find a parallel in this point among the Dissenters; and this is certainly no difficult task; for 'a learned ministry' is no where more highly esteemed than amongst the Calvinistic Dissenters." [We are glad to hear this, and also to believe it true.] "The Congregational Magazine has lately asserted, that the body of the non-conformist ministers are as learned as their brethren (*i. e.* priests) of the

'dominant sect.' In exegetical and hermeneutical theology, I think they are decidedly more learned than the established clergy, whilst in classical attainments they are beneath them: for it is a fact well known, that at the two great Universities, and especially at Cambridge, theology is so little studied, taught, or encouraged, that the clerical candidates do sometimes approach episcopal ordinations, in a state of extreme ignorance on those subjects, in which it would be but decent that they should have *some* information. This truth is so apparent, that a notorious prelate has lately talked of establishing a theological school, to prepare the candidates for examination, and to furnish them with that theology which they failed to acquire at the university; and yet it is extremely probable, that these young gentlemen, whose pinions are ingloriously deploomed by a Bishop's chaplain, would be able to pass a brilliant examination in Greek tragedies and comedies, in Greek and Latin versification, or in a course of pure mathematics. There is more knowledge of the Hebrew language amongst dissenting ministers than amongst the clergy; but, in a critical knowledge of the Greek, the clergy excel the non-conformists. In a general acquaintance with *history*, and the range of the belles lettres, the superiority is again with the 'learned' clergy; but in those things which it behoves erudite Levites to understand; that is, in all *clerical lore*—in all solid divinity—the non-conformist ministers far surpass their well-paid antagonists."—Letters, p. 39.

From a great deal of miscellaneous matter in the concluding letters, we extract this acute statement of the rationale of Methodist tactics in Church questions.

"The fact is, that conference perceives the signs of decadence in the Established Church: it expects, as all other classes of society do, the downfall of the establishment, and is wisely resolved to observe a strict neutrality in the workings of this great catastrophe. The Methodists could not begin a warfare against the Church, without materially perplexing and impeding the smooth course of their own affairs; for, if conference were to allow their people to meddle with the inflammatory matter of Church Reform, they could not be surprised to see their own house taking fire in the progress of the warfare.

'Nam tua res agitur paries quum proximus ardet.'

"It would be an act of insanity in the rulers of Methodism, to allow their vast body, which, even now, is with much difficulty kept within bounds, to agitate such questions as are of necessity involved in a controversy with the Church; for who does not see, that if once they were permitted to attack priests, tithes, church-rates, and the arbitrary power of the clergy, and to investigate the scriptural foundations of the establishment, they must, of necessity, go a step further, and conclude, that conference itself is a mere usurpation, and an invention of man's artifice. It is, therefore, the obvious policy of conference, to avoid this controversy, and we need not be surprised to see them expelling without

mercy, those members or ministers, who have temerariously handled the burning coal of 'Church and State.' Conference stands as much in need of conservative management as the Church of England itself; the Wesleyan rulers are wise in their generation, and thoroughly understand the act of avoiding what is dangerous, as well as adopting what is politic."—Letters, p. 115.

C. W.

ART. IV.—TRACTS FOR THE PEOPLE, DESIGNED TO VINDICATE RELIGIOUS AND CHRISTIAN LIBERTY. Vol. I. London: Effingham Wilson; J. Green; &c.

(*Second Notice.*)

THE necessity for reverting to the great principles on which Protestantism in general rests, or, to speak more definitely, RELIGIOUS and CHRISTIAN LIBERTY, which, though the foundation of Protestantism, were never truly held by the *soi-disant* Protestant Established Churches, is becoming every day more and more apparent. The exertions which have been, and are, making by the members of those Churches to place them in their most offensive attitude, call for counter-efforts, and though dissenters are not backward in looking for their political rights, and urging their peculiar opinions, they seem almost to have lost sight of the grand foundation, that the subjects of Christ's kingdom are not, in matters relating to it, accountable to any other master. This is ably maintained in the first of the Tracts to be at present noticed (the 5th of the Series). It is a Sermon that was preached in March 1717, before the first of the Hanoverian dynasty, ancestor in the sixth ascending degree of our present beloved Queen, by Benjamin (Hoadly,) Lord Bishop of Bangor, a sermon which went through a very great number of editions, and gave rise to the Bangorian Controversy, in which almost every able writer of the day was engaged. It was printed by the King's command, as a mark of approbation, but drew on the Bishop the resentment of the Lower House of Convocation, who issued a denunciation "of its dangerous positions and doctrines," and would have proceeded further if they had not been completely stopped by a royal prorogation. The King did not indeed desert his principles, but with the concurrence of his Ministry promoted him in the Church, and he finally attained, in the succeeding reign, the see of Winchester. The object of this Sermon was to investigate "the nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ," and the text chosen was John xviii. 36: "Jesus answered, my kingdom is not of this world." Hence the writer, after some preliminary remarks on the changes in the meaning of words, lays down that Christ is sole head of his Church, "sole lawgiver to his subjects," "sole judge of their behaviour in the affairs of conscience and eternal salvation." "He has left behind him no visible human authority, no vicegerents, who can be said properly to supply his place; no interpreters upon whom his subjects are absolutely to depend, no judges over the consciences or religion of his people." After

enlarging on each of these divisions in a very convincing manner, he proceeds to show that the sanctions of Christ's laws have all of them a reference to a future world only. "They are declarations of those conditions to be performed in this world on our part, without which God will not make us happy in that to come. And they are almost all appeals to the will of that God; to his nature, known by the common reason of mankind; and to the imitation of that nature, which must be our perfection. The *keeping his commandments*, is declared the way to life; and the *doing his will*, the entrance into the kingdom of heaven. The being subjects to Christ is to this very end, that we may the better, and more effectually, perform the will of God."

"The sanctions of Christ's law are rewards and punishments. But of what sort? Not the rewards of this world; not the offices or glories of this state; not the pains of prisons, banishments, fines, or any lesser and more moderate penalties; nay, not the much lesser negative discouragements that belong to human society. He was far from thinking that these could be the instruments of such a persuasion as he thought acceptable to God."—p. 11.

The rest of the discourse follows up these remarks, from which we shall make another short quotation.

"The peace of Christ's Kingdom is a manly and reasonable peace built upon charity, and love and mutual forbearance, and receiving one another, as God receives us. As for any other peace, founded upon a submission of our honesty as well as our understanding, it is falsely so called. It is not the peace of the Kingdom of Christ, but the lethargy of it; and a sleep unto death, when his subjects shall throw off their relations to him, for their subjection to others, and even in cases where they have a right to see, and where they think they see, his will otherwise, shall shut their eyes and go blindfold at the command of others, because those others are not pleased with their enquiries into the will of their great Lord and Judge."—p. 16.

We cannot be surprised that such a Sermon, coming from a Bishop, and sanctioned by the King, should have excited the indignation and resentment of the high Church party, when after the lapse of more than a century, Bishops have been freely censured, and obliged to apologize to their own Clergy, for a mere act of courtesy to a dissenter! If Convocations could now sit like Scotch General Assemblies, how would the offender against *authority* be treated by the Thorpes and Wodehouses, the Molesworths and Sewells, of the present day? We may judge by the proceedings against the Author of "The Morning and Evening Sacrifice."

The next Tract in succession was published shortly before the Sermon last mentioned. We fix this time because it

was after the publication of Clarke's Scripture Doctrine in 1714, and before the suppression of the Convocation, for Whiston mentions that that body was offended at its humour. The Tract is reprinted from the collected works of the Author in 1746. This Author was Dr. Francis Hare, who in the early part of his life was a vindicator of Queen Anne's Whig Administration; after his promotion to a deanery, joined with Dr. Sherlock and others in the Bangorian Controversy against Bp. Hoadly. He was afterwards made a Bishop. The object of the Tract is to advise a young Clergyman not to devote himself to the studies of the Scriptures on account of the danger with which it would be attended. On this topic he enlarges fully, and instances the cases of Mr. Whiston and Dr. Clarke, (without naming them) who, by devoting themselves to such study, had incurred the charge of heresy, and were debarred from all preferment. "Whatever you do," says the writer to his friend, "be *orthodox*: orthodoxy will cover a multitude of sins, but a cloud of virtues cannot cover the want of the minutest particle of orthodoxy." He advises, therefore, any study but that of the Scriptures—classics, mathematics, and other sciences, from devotion to which there could be no danger, and the Bishop seems to have been so far serious, as to have acted on his own recommendation. Indeed, if it were not for a kind of postscript, we might think it well-fitted to accompany the Oxford Tracts. But in this conclusion, he avows that he thinks Clergymen should not lay aside the study of Scripture, but that all discouragements to the free study of them ought to be removed. The Tract has therefore been considered as "one of the best pieces of irony in the English language." It was reprinted in this series because, "the Bible, the Bible only," "is the publicly declared motto of an immense body of Christians, and is inscribed in flaming colours upon all exclusive Protestant banners;" and yet if any one by the study of it, "exercising the Protestant right and duty of private judgment, arrive at conclusions not palatable to the multitude, or not agreeable" to the standard adopted by any Church, such student is treated as if guilty of some shocking crime. We freely avow that this Tract is not a favourite with us, but we admit that it fully and strikingly exposes the absurdity of requiring men to take the *Bible only* as their standard; and yet only allowing them to read it in conformity with a prescribed creed. Far better with the Romanists and Oxonians to deny that *it is the standard*, and to refer at once to the dogmas of the Church.

Dr. Edward Gibson, who was promoted to the see of London, and who was a contemporary of the authors of the two preceding

Tracts, was a man of very extensive learning, and universally esteemed for his virtue and amiable qualities. But though originally promoted by Lord Chancellor Somers and Archbishop Tennison, he was not friendly to dissenters from the establishment. In 1713 he published a celebrated work entitled "Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani, or the statutes, constitution, canons, rubricks, and Articles of the Church of England, methodically digested under their proper heads, &c." "The scheme of Church power vindicated in this volume," says one of his biographers, "was excepted against, not only by dissenters, but by the soundest and most constitutional lawyers within the pale of the Church; who maintained that the principles and claims advanced in it would be sufficient, if acted upon in their utmost extent, to establish a sacerdotal empire, which must draw all power to itself, and render the civil magistrate its minister and dependent."

As Bishop Gibson acted on the principles of his book, and was zealous in his opposition to the dissenters and their claims, he became no favourite with the ministry of that day, and at the instigation, it is said, of the Lord Chief Justice Hardwicke, Mr. Foster (afterwards Sir Michael Foster, and one of the Judges of the Court of King's Bench,) wrote an answer to it, published first in 1735. The editor of the Tracts conceives that the assertions frequently thrown out by the High Church party, required the republication of this answer to the Codex by a lawyer of such authority as Sir Michael Foster. "In it, it is proved that the CHURCH is the CREATURE of the state—to be ruled, changed and REFORMED, as the Crown, by the advice of Parliament, shall determine." The party in Scotland now seeking to establish a power over the legislature and courts of law, under the pretext of popular election, would do well to study "this Examination of the scheme of Church power." We are not hostile to the free election of Ministers by their hearers, but as their ancestors chose to give up this privilege for the advantages and emoluments of an Established Church, and the appointment by Patrons is the law of the land, we cannot see why they should enjoy both the privilege and the equivalent for it, and receive pay from dissenters as well as others, when the latter become such, almost entirely in consequence of their attachment to the free election, agreeing with the establishment in their adherence to the Westminster confession. The clergy of both establishments would gladly have all appointments from the Archbishop to the Curate rest with themselves, and would then soon make the state as subordinate to the Church as it was in the worst days of Popery. But let us hope that such is not to

be apprehended; and turn to extracts from the *golden* remains of the *ever memorable* JOHN HALES, which form the eighth Tract. This eminent man lived in the time of James the First and Charles the First, and was patronised by Archbishop Laud. Accounts of him by Lord Clarendon, and by Bishop Pearson, who published an edition of his works, are prefixed to the Tract. We shall extract a passage from the noble historian, as likely to lead our readers to refer to the treatise concerning Schism, which occupies the greater part of the Tract.

"Nothing troubled him more than the brawls which were grown from religion; and he therefore exceedingly detested the tyranny of the Church of Rome, more from their imposing uncharitably upon the consciences of other men, than for the errors in their own opinions; and would often say, that he would renounce the religion of the Church of England to-morrow, if it obliged him to believe that any other Christian should be damned; and that no body would conclude another man to be damned, who did not wish him so. No man more strict or severe to himself; to other men, so charitable as to their opinions, that he thought that other men were more in fault for their carriage towards them, than the men themselves were who erred, and he thought that pride and passion, more than conscience, were the cause of all separation from each other's communion; and he frequently said that that only kept the world from agreeing upon such a liturgy as might bring them into one communion; *all doctrinal points upon which men differed in their opinions being to have no place in any liturgy.* Upon an occasional discourse with a friend, of the frequent and uncharitable reproaches of heretic and schismatic, too lightly thrown at each other, amongst men who differ in their judgment, he writ a little discourse of schism, contained in less than two sheets of paper; which being transmitted from friend to friend in writing, was at last, without any malice, brought to the view of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Laud, who was a very rigid surveyor of all things which never so little bordered upon schism, and thought the Church could not be too vigilant against and jealous of such incursions."

To the Treatise on Schism are annexed some extracts from sermons, of which we shall quote a passage from that on private judgment.

"It is a question made by John Gerson, some time Chancellor of Paris, '*wherefore hath God given me the light of reason and conscience, if I must suffer myself to be led and governed by the reason and conscience of another man?*' Will any of you befriend me so far as to assert * this question? For I must confess I cannot. It was the speech of a good husbandman—'*It is but a folly to possess a piece of ground except you till it.*' And how then can it stand with reason, that a man should be possessed of so goodly a piece of the Lord's pasture as is this light of understanding and reason, which he hath endued us with in the day of

* Clear from difficulty, explain, answer.

our creation, if he suffer it to lie untilled, or sow not in it the Lord's seed?"

We now come to the ninth Tract, 'on the Nature of true Religion,' by Sir Mathew Hale, who was Chief Justice both in the time of the Protectorate and the reign of Charles the Second, having resigned his office a few months before his death in 1676. He was a member of the Church of England, but lived in friendship with several Non-conformists, and amongst others the celebrated Baxter, who was the first publisher of the treatise. The spirit and tendency of this work may be judged from the following extract, which in all that is essential, is as applicable to the present time, as that in which it was written, though the subjects of controversy are not as prevalent.

"There are some superadditions to religion, that, though I do not think they are to be condemned, yet are carefully to be distinguished from the true and natural life of religion; and so long as they are kept under that apprehension, they may, if prudently applied and managed, do good. But if either they are imprudently instituted, imprudently applied or inconsiderately over-valued, as if they were religion, they may and many times do harm.

"It is a pitiful thing to see men run upon this mistake, especially in these latter times; one placing all his religion in holding the Pope to be Christ's vicar; another placing religion in this, to hold no Papist can be saved: one holding all religion to consist in holding Episcopacy to be *jure divino*; another, by holding Presbytery to be *jure divino*; another, in crying up congregational government; another, in Anabaptize; one, in placing all religion in the strict observation of all ceremonies; another, in a strict refusal of all: one, holding a great part of religion in putting off the hat and bowing at the name of Jesus; another, judging a man an idolater for it; and a third, placing his religion in putting off his hat to none; and so, like a company of boys that blow bubbles out of a walnut shell, every one runs after his bubble, and calls it *Religion*; and every one measures the religion or irreligion of another by their agreeing or dissenting with them in these or the like matters; and at best, while we scramble amd wrangle about the pieces of the shell, the kernel is either lost, or gotten by some that doth not prize any of their contents.

"Believe it, Religion is quite another thing from all these matters. He that fears the Lord of heaven and earth, walks humbly before him, thankfully lays hold of the message of redemption by Christ Jesus, strives to express his thankfulness by the sincerity of his obedience, is sorry with all his soul when he comes short of his duty, walks watchfully in the denial of himself, and holds no confederacy with any lust or known sin, if he falls in the least measure is restless till he hath made his peace by true repentance, is true in his promise, just in his actions, charitable to the poor, sincere in his devotions; that will not deliberately dishonour God, though with the greatest security of impunity;

that hath his hope in heaven and his conversation in heaven; that dare not do an unjust act, though never so much to his advantage; and all this because he sees Him that is invisible, and fears him because he loves Him, fears Him as well for his goodness as his greatness;—such a man, whether he be an Episcopal, or a Presbyterian, or an Independent, or an Anabaptist, whether he wears a surplice or wears none, whether he hears organs or hears none, whether he kneels at the communion or for conscience' sake stands or sits,—he hath the *life of religion* in him, and that life acts in him and will conform his soul to the image of his Saviour, and walk along with him to eternity, notwithstanding his practice or non-practice of these indifferents.

"On the other side, if a man fears not the eternal God, dares commit any sin with presumption, can drink excessively, swear vainly or falsely, commit adultery, lie, cozen, cheat, break his promises, live loosely,—though he practise every ceremony never so curiously, or as stubbornly oppose them; though he cry down bishops or cry down presbytery; though he be re-baptized every day, or though he disclaim against it as heresy; though he fast all the Lent, or fasts out of pretence of avoiding superstition,—yet, notwithstanding these and a thousand more external conformities or zealous oppositions of them, he wants the Life of Religion."

We noticed the tenth and eleventh Tracts in our former Number, p. 97; and though we would willingly give extracts from the latter, which is peculiarly applicable to Scotland, we refrain, from a fear of tiring our readers. The twelfth consists of five small tracts, called "Golden Testimonies on behalf of Religious and Christian Liberty." We thank the editors for the service they have rendered to this great cause by the republication of so much valuable matter, which, though in great part written in a style which may appear antiquated, should be "embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life." It is, indeed, delightful to be able, amidst the raging bigotry of the present day, to refer to Milton and Hale and Foster amongst lawyers and statesmen, to Hoadly and Hales amongst Churchmen, not to speak of some distinguished moderns, as favouring the opinion that religion consists not so much in the peculiar doctrines advocated by different sects, as in purity of heart and life, and in enlarged and universal benevolence, which may exist with any of those doctrines, and which are not necessarily connected with any of them. Whilst we feel it a sacred duty to use the light of reason and conscience bestowed upon us, and to seek truth without regard to the authority of Creeds or Churches, we avow there is nothing so odious to us, wheresoever found, as that assumption of infallibility, which leads a man to condemn his fellow-man because, in exercising the same right, he may arrive at a different conclusion. Δ.

## Art. V.—UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

*Observations on the Statutes of the University of Cambridge.* By the Very Rev. Dr. Peacock, Dean of Ely, Vice President of the Royal Society, and Professor of Astronomy and Geometry in the University of Cambridge. London: 1841.

*Clerical Education considered, with an especial reference to the Universities.* By the Rev. Charles Perry, M.A., Fellow and late Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: 1841.

University Education is justly regarded with much interest, by the higher classes of Society, in England, at the present day, and the observations of clergymen of learning and practical experience on this department of national improvement, must be received with attention, even when they do not altogether command the unqualified assent of all denominations of the laity to the whole system of changes which is earnestly proposed for adoption.

The ancient universities of Oxford and Cambridge are fortunate in possessing the power of instructing a large number of the youthful aristocracy and gentry of this country; they also enjoy the privilege of educating the sons of the clergy of the Church of England, who are compelled to obtain a university degree, as an introduction to episcopal ordination, which can alone qualify them for holding church livings;—students who are intended for the legal profession find it frequently advantageous to pass through the routine of University instruction before they are called to the bar, and several medical students are always found among the resident members of these venerable seats of learning.

In addition to their aristocratical and professional advantages, the universities are also enriched by large sums of money, which are placed at the disposal of the college authorities of Oxford and Cambridge, as the rewards of successful learning.

The total annual value of the pecuniary benefits thus conferred upon learned men, and especially upon learned clergymen, has been recently estimated in the following table, by the Rev. H. L. Jones, M.A., of the University of Cambridge.

Oxford Colleges.

| | | Estimated Annual Income. |
|---|---|---|
| 24 | Heads of Houses . . . | £18,350 |
| 557 | Fellows . . . . . | 116,560 |
| 399 | Scholars . . . . . | 6,030 |
| 199 | College officers . . . | 15,650 |
| | Total . . | £156,590 |

Cambridge Colleges.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 17 | Heads of Houses . . . | £12,650 |
| 431 | Fellows . . . . . | 90,330 |
| 793 | Scholars . . . . . | 13,390 |
| 179 | College officers . . . | 17,750 |
| | Total . . | £134,120 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Total estimated Annual Income of Oxford and Cambridge Colleges . . | £291,710 |

A small proportion, comparatively, of this vast amount of college preferment is placed in the hands of the government of the country; and the Mastership of Trinity College, Cambridge, is probably the most valuable and the most influential college endowment in either University, which is held at the disposal of the sovereign: but the pecuniary importance of this Mastership, which is usually estimated at £1,500 per annum, or £2,000 at the very utmost, is of slight consequence, when compared with the educational influence, which may be exercised by the master of such a large and popular institution, as he possesses also the appointment of the college tutors.

After the experience of a residence of nearly a quarter of a century in Trinity College, Cambridge, as a fellow and tutor of the college, and after a minute and searching examination into the ancient statutes of the University, and the principal colleges of Cambridge, the Dean of Ely has recently published a very interesting work, at the commencement of which he declares his opinion, that very few vestiges remain, at the present time, either of the former system of University Education, which was prescribed in the old statutes, or of the practical regulations which they enforce.

The learned Dean also states, in the same volume, that the task of reform has either been considered hopeless and impracticable in the University itself, or that it has been checked by the

apprehension of incurring the charge of attempting innovations, whose ultimate consequences the reformers could not foresee. The great majority of the members of the University are likewise supposed by the Dean to have considered that the safety of that institution might be endangered by any attempt at reform or reparation, "which could expose and make manifest the rotten timbers, which were concealed in its structure: and that, remembering the indignation and ridicule which had generally attended all previous attempts at innovation, they have been contented to rest satisfied with the continuance of a system which had been acquiesced in, for so many generations, without remonstrance or complaint."

After giving the example of the antiquated form of supplication which is still used for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, the Dean of Ely says, "In whatever direction we examine our academical proceedings, we shall meet with similar consequences of the discrepancy which exists between the written law and the practice of the University; our oaths and formulæ refer to the written law, while our real transactions, and more especially those which involve the conditions of graduation, refer to the practice of the University."

The Dean judiciously recommends a general revision of the College Statutes, and he appears to wish that the Elizabethan code of the University laws should be remodelled under the joint authority of the Crown and the University.

Mr. Perry, in his pamphlet on Clerical Education, views the present state of the University under a different light, and he openly accuses the University of a breach of trust in not providing a system of theological instruction adapted to the wants of the present age, as the ancient divinity course of education, which is now obsolete, was probably adapted to the wants of the majority of the students, in the age when the University statutes were originally framed.

Both the Dean of Ely and Mr. Perry are earnestly desirous to establish a regular system of theological instruction for the divinity students of the Church of England, at Cambridge, and sanguine hopes are entertained, that the Senate of the University will appoint a committee on this important subject.

The great object of the examinations into intellectual attainments, which are required at Cambridge, for the divinity students, in common with the lay students, appears to be to maintain and increase worldly credit and intellectual power by suitable rewards; and as knowledge on theological subjects is now gradually spreading throughout society in England, the rising generation of the clergy will probably be required by the Bishops

to place themselves in advance of the laity, by their proficiency in Theological studies.

The ancient Universities are described by Mr. Perry as in strict connexion with the Established Church; and the greater number of the Heads of Houses, professors, fellows, and tutors of colleges, resident within those Universities, are undoubtedly clergymen, and clergymen are considered the proper persons to superintend the professional education of those students who intend to enter the Ministry, and who now constitute nearly one half of the total number of the resident students in the University.

But there is another subject to be considered; Is it just and fair, that nearly the whole of the political power of the ancient Universities should be monopolized in the nineteenth century by any one profession? or that nearly all the best pecuniary rewards of Oxford and Cambridge should now be held by clergymen?

In 1727, Dr. Woodward founded a Professorship of Geology at Cambridge, and he then gently expressed his sentiments on the vast preponderance of the preferments of the clergy, in the following words of his will:—

"My will further is, that if a divine shall at any time happen to be a competitor with a layman for this lectureship, (of Geology,) in case the latter shall be as well qualified, he shall ever have preference of the former; not out of any disrespect to the clergy, (for whom I have ever had a particular regard,) but because there is in this kingdom better provision, and a much greater number of preferments for the clergy, than for men of learning among the laity."

A principal reason of the extraordinary disproportion between the rewards of learning for the clergy and the laity, which was thus mentioned by Dr. Woodward, may probably be found in the warm and enthusiastic attachment which was formerly manifested towards the Roman Catholic Church, in England, in those ages which succeeded the crusades, and which are remarkable in English history, from the misery and confusion occasioned by the sanguinary civil wars of the rival families of York and Lancaster.

Superstitious feelings were at that time aided by the political advantages which were gained from the good will of the powerful aristocracy of the Roman Catholic clergy, and the representations of general weakness in the Church militant were consequently answered by generous donations, from sovereigns and other illustrious personages, who founded and endowed large colleges, in both the Universities of Oxford and Cam-

bridge, and elsewhere, to increase the authority and influence of the Roman Catholic Church, and to provide, as they supposed, for their own benefit, a regular supply of studious persons, to pray for their welfare as long as they lived, and to pray also for the souls of their forefathers, and for their own souls, after they had departed from this life.

With these objects it is probable that King's College, Cambridge, was founded by Henry the Sixth, in 1441, and in the early statutes of that society, the Church of Rome was represented as severely wounded, both from the small numbers of the clerical body, owing to pestilence, war, and other worldly calamities, while the King willingly devoted his royal labors to alleviate the general weakness of the Church militant, pitying so sad a desolation, though he could not really supply a complete remedy.

Eton College was founded by the same monarch, for similar reasons, at the same time, as a college of poor and indigent scholars and clerks, who were expected to learn the accidence in the royal town of Eton, near Windsor, in the diocese of Lincoln; and both these ancient Roman Catholic colleges were dedicated "to the praise, honour, and glory of the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the most glorious Mary, his mother, who is always a virgin: for the maintenance and advancement of the Christian faith, for the advantage of the Holy Church, for the encouragement of divine worship, and for the promotion of the liberal arts, sciences, and faculties."

King's College was ordained to be, for ever, a college of poor and indigent scholars in the studies of the University of Cambridge, in the diocese of Ely, and the members were required to study and attain proficiency in various sciences and faculties. This College was specially dedicated to "the honor of Almighty God, in whose hands are the hearts of kings; to the honor also of the most blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary, the Mother of Christ; and of the most glorious confessor, Pope Nicholas, on whose festival the royal founder had been born into the light of day, to the extirpation of heresies and errors which disturb the peace of long settled kingdoms and universities, and which had injured the kingdom of England, in some of its subjects; to promote an increase of the clergy, and to advance the honor of holy mother Church, whose offices ought to be committed to fit persons, who, like stars, might give light, in their own watches, and who might instruct the people, alike by their doctrine and by their example."

The college which was thus founded was to be governed according to the statutes which should afterwards be enacted by a majority of the following five commissioners, or by a majority

of their survivors, namely, the Bishops of Lincoln and Salisbury, the Keeper of the Privy Seal, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, for the benefit of persons who should sojourn in the University of Cambridge, with a view to study, and to pray for the welfare of the founder as long as he lived, and for his soul, and for the souls of his illustrious father and mother, and of all his forefathers, and of all the faithful dead.

It is manifest, from these specimens of the ancient Roman Catholic foundation deeds of King's College, Cambridge, that ecclesiastical objects were then considered far more important for that college than the promotion of literature and science. King Henry the Sixth expressly declared his wish, in one of these documents, that "Holy Scripture, or the sacred page, the mother and mistress of all other sciences, might extend her habitation more widely, that she might surpass all the other sciences, and that philosophy might not be wanting, but that she also might peaceably strive with the former pursuits," (*i. e.* probably with Theology, Civil Law, Medicine, and Music, which were the great departments of ancient University Education.)

But Ecclesiastical persons were at that time frequently in the possession of the most responsible offices of the government: a priest might be the keeper of the privy seal, or the chancellor of the exchequer; and ecclesiastics were uniformly chosen as the chancellors of the University of Cambridge.

In the business of ancient University education, four years of philosophical study were first given to attain the degree of Bachelor of Arts; then three years of additional intellectual learning were required for the degree of Master of Arts; and at the termination of this literary and scientific apprenticeship of seven years, the divinity students were intended, generally, to commence the study of Theology. This order of succession may possibly have occasioned the arrangement, according to which the studies of Trinity College, Cambridge, are mentioned by its royal founder King Henry the Eighth, in the foundation charter of that society. Trinity College was founded as an institution for learning, for the sciences, for philosophy, for elegant accomplishments, and for sacred theology. But a period of nineteen years' duration was then required, by the statutes of the University of Cambridge, for the degree of Doctor of Divinity, and in this period fourteen years were ordained for the preliminary degree of Bachelor of Divinity; in which time seven years of study in the faculty of Arts were included as the introductory portion of Theological study. These long periods were, however, found, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth,

to be so burdensome, that the majority of the students were determined not to remain in the University during such a large portion of their lives; and, gradually, the lower degrees of Master of Arts and of Bachelor of Arts acquired new power and increased respect, while the Divinity degrees were seldom taken, and were not considered to be always essential.

The age of entrance into the University also increased from twelve or fourteen years to sixteen, eighteen, and even nineteen or twenty years, and the students could not afterwards be induced to remain even to take the degree of Master of Arts, at Cambridge. In the year 1608, an interpretation of the Elizabethan statutes was passed by the Heads of Houses, in the University of Cambridge, declaring, that those persons "who for their learning and manners had been admitted Bachelors of Arts, were not so strictly tied to a local commorancy and study, in the University, but that being able, at the end of nine terms, by their accustomed exercises, and by other examinations, to approve themselves worthy to be Masters of Arts, they might justly be admitted to that degree."

One of the reasons assigned for this serious departure from the ancient statutes, was worded in the following manner by the Heads of Houses:—

"That a man once grounded so far in learning as to deserve a Bachelorship in Arts, is sufficiently furnished to proceed in study, by himself, and with such conference as he may easily have elsewhere, to attain perfection enough, not only for a Mastership, but for higher degrees also, as experience daily teacheth."

But before the close of the seventeenth century, some difficulty occurred in compelling the students to reside for the first degree of Bachelor of Arts. Laymen were then mingled, in considerable numbers, with the students, who were intended for the ministry, and in the eighteenth century the ancient system of disputations was succeeded by the modern plan of examinations, and the lowest degree in the University, the Bachelorship in the faculty of Arts, rose far above all the other University degrees, in real importance, owing to the successful establishment of a voluntary examination in the Mathematical sciences, as a new method of qualification for that degree.

Non-residence, after the degree of Bachelor of Arts had already rendered the professional instruction in Divinity insignificant for University degrees, and the great care which was bestowed on the examination for the Mathematical Tripos, added materially to the popularity of scientific studies, and secularized the system of education to a considerable extent.

A second voluntary examination, purely classical, and termed the Classical Tripos, was afterwards introduced, to succeed the Mathematical Tripos, and it is probable that, before long, this classical examination may be allowed to take its stand by its scientific sister, as equally efficient, in its intellectual requirements, to qualify students for the degree of Bachelor of Arts.

So completely has the ancient Theological character of the colleges now disappeared at Cambridge, that when the Bishop of St. David's (Dr. Thirlwall) wrote a pamphlet, in 1834, on the admission of dissenters to Academical Degrees, he observes, in that publication, that he was almost ashamed of stating so evident and notorious a fact, that the colleges of the University of Cambridge are not theological seminaries; that they are so far from being dedicated exclusively or principally to the study of theology at the present day, that among all the branches of learning cultivated in them, there is none which occupies a smaller portion of the time and attention of the students than theology.

The colleges of Cambridge have been, in fact, secularized, by the increased value of the literary and scientific degree of Bachelor of Arts, by the general desire of the students not to continue a residence in the University in order to take strictly Theological degrees, and, more than all, by the spirit of the times, which renders a good education a silent token of a gentleman, and which induces hundreds of laymen, totally unconnected with the ecclesiastical profession, to submit to the usual course of instruction at Cambridge, in order to gain the credit of their literary or scientific exertions, by graduating in that University.

No examination exists, at the present day, for the degree of Master of Arts, at Cambridge; and this second degree in Arts may be taken, at the proper time, as a matter of course, about three years subsequent to the Bachelor's degree. It is right, also, to observe, that scholarships and fellowships are intimately associated with the system of degrees at Cambridge. No Bachelor of Arts can be elected a scholar of any college; and in Trinity College, any scholar who does not take his degree of Bachelor of Arts, at the proper time, may be deprived of his scholarship on that account.

Fellowships are in general only open to Bachelors of Arts at Cambridge; and for this reason the admission of dissenters to Academical degrees was naturally regarded as the first step which would afterwards lead dissenters to become candidates for the vacant fellowships in the various colleges of the University.

The degree of Master of Arts is of much importance in de-

termining the emoluments of a fellow; and in the case of a lay fellow of Trinity College, the term of fellowship is usually limited to seven years from the degree of Master of Arts, unless he chooses to enter into Priest's orders, when he is allowed to retain his fellowship, as long as he remains unmarried, and does not obtain any valuable ecclesiastical preferment.

The examinations for scholarships and fellowships are purely literary and scientific, consisting principally of Mathematics, Greek and Latin, but without any Theological questions. Indeed, the period of the undergraduateship, when scholarships are given, was always devoted to the studies of literature and science, and, in like manner, the three years of the possession of the degree of Bachelorship of Arts, when fellowships are bestowed, were considered as belonging to the faculty of Arts, and therefore the occupations were literary and scientific. The period of professional education then succeeded after the degree of Master of Arts, and in ancient times, the business of a teacher only commenced with the Master's degree.

At the present day, Bachelors of Arts, who are fellows, frequently reside at Cambridge as private tutors, and are sometimes even appointed assistant college tutors in Trinity College.

In the smaller colleges of the University of Cambridge, the Mathematical honors, obtained in the voluntary examination for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, form the principal guides to the college authorities, for the succession to the vacant fellowships. At St. John's College, the Mathematical honors are duly considered in the election of the fellows, although a separate fellowship examination is also instituted in that college; and at Trinity College, very few fellows are elected who have not previously distinguished themselves in the Mathematical Tripos, and who do not manifest afterwards in the fellowship examination decided proofs of an intimate acquaintance with Greek and Latin literature, Moral Philosophy, and Mathematical science.

Sir John Herschel, who was formerly a fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, was also Senior Wrangler in the Mathematical Tripos of 1813. The Dean of Ely (Dr. Peacock) was the Second Wrangler in the same year, and was afterwards elected a fellow and tutor of Trinity College: and in like manner, the Rev. Charles Perry obtained the Senior Wranglership in 1827, and subsequently became a fellow and tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge; thus showing the intimate relationship between the Mathematical Tripos and the fellowships.

Private tutors constitute, at the present day, another remarkable feature of University education at Cambridge, and they

are now becoming serious rivals to the college tutors, in their influence over the students. The Dean of Ely bitterly complains of this innovation on ancient practice and academical regulations, and very properly traces it to the increased severity of the degree examinations, and to the absorbing interest which is felt for the necessary preparation for those trials of skill and memory: he observes very candidly, that "the reign of private tuition and of systematic cramming* has thus been affirmed and extended, and that the influence of the professional and public instruction of the University has consequently declined."

But there are advantages as well as disadvantages in this increased severity of the examinations for degrees; the mental acquisition by many of the students of a large mass of producible knowledge on several different subjects, is in itself an intellectual achievement, requiring long and patient exertion, and the amount of study and mental labour is thus found to be augmented among those young men, "whose industry is rather stimulated by their fears than by their ambition and love of knowledge."

The Dean also states, that the best effects have been consequent upon the increased severity of the examinations, both as regards the orderly habits and the general occupations of a great majority of the undergraduates.†

A curious calculation of the pecuniary results of the modern system of private tuition at Cambridge is given by the Dean in his Observations, from which it appears, that an amount of £52,000 per annum is paid by the students of the University for private tuition alone, entirely independent of all fees to college tutors or to University professors.

The statistical account of this enormous annual income for private tuition is thus explained by the Dean:—

"The ordinary payment made to a private tutor is £14 per term; £10 is generally paid for the Christmas vacation, and £30 for the long vacation, whether at Cambridge or elsewhere. It is not an unfrequent practice for a student to engage a classical and a mathematical tutor on alternate days, and sometimes even on the same day; the system extends to students of all classes, industrious or idle, rich or poor; and so very general has the practice become, that it would not be an extravagant estimate to fix the *average* annual expenditure of every student at the University for private tuition, at £40. If we assume the average number of students throughout the year to be 1300, this will amount to £52,000 per annum, or more than three times the

* Observations, p. 162. † Observations, p. 162.

sum paid to the whole body of public tutors and professors in the University."

When it is considered that the main object of this enormous annual expenditure is the gradual preparation of the vast majority of the students of the University for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, it will be easily understood, that this degree is considered of no slight value in the University: it forms in fact the key to the whole system of modern University education, whether in the Colleges or in the University; it is pre-eminently "the degree," and the honourable possession of this degree is regarded as an intellectual and gentlemanly object of ambition, throughout the British Empire. In some cases, as in keeping terms in the Inns of Court, a distinction of two years is made between churchmen, who are graduates of one of the ancient Universities, and dissenters, who are only able to obtain the honors, without the substantial possession of the degree. Every graduate of Cambridge may be called to the bar in two years less time than his dissenting contemporary, who rests contented with merely obtaining his place as a wrangler or a senior optime in the mathematical lists at Cambridge, and who does not choose to sign the Church of England test required on graduation.

To these advantages of churchmen graduates over dissenters, Lord Palmerston probably alluded, on the 26th March, 1834, when he related the following anecdote to the House of Commons: Lord Erskine had entered on the study of the law rather late in life, and was at first discouraged with the prospect of the long probation which he should have to go through, when it was suggested to him, that if he went down to Cambridge, and took his degree there, to which his previous studies had entitled him, it would be of essential service to him. Lord Erskine accordingly returned to Cambridge, took his degree, and instead of quitting his profession, he was encouraged to persevere in it, and he afterwards attributed his eminence as a lawyer, mainly to the advantages of that degree.

"If Lord Erskine had been a dissenter," observed Lord Palmerston, "he would have been cut off from this resource, and the English bar would have lost one of its brightest ornaments."

After Lord Palmerston had addressed the House on this occasion, he was followed in the debate by Sir Robert Peel, who asked the following question respecting the college foundations in the Universities:—

"Will you, or will you not, admit dissenters to scholarships?"

Lord Palmerston immediately answered this query in two short words, "Why not?"

Sir Robert Peel then continued, "The noble Lord says, 'why

not?' He feels so strongly the force of the argument, that if the dissenters are admitted to degrees, you cannot exclude them from the other benefits and emoluments of the institution, of which they will thus become members, that he at once concedes the further privilege of being admitted to scholarships. Will he stop there? even if he does, I say, he abandons the ground taken in this petition:* he abandons the ground on which the member for Cambridge, (Mr. Spring Rice, now Lord Monteagle,) and the secretary for the Colonies, (Lord Stanley,) profess to take their stand. If the petition means anything, it means that the privilege of the dissenter shall be limited to the degree, and that he shall not be admitted on the foundation of the respective colleges."

Now it is manifest, that if, in addition to the claims of literature and science, pecuniary considerations are to be thus superinduced, the dissenters must exert themselves with no slight energy and perseverance, to induce the legislature to open even lay degrees, at Oxford and Cambridge, to their acceptance. The endowment of Trinity College, Cambridge, was originally Roman Catholic property, which was confiscated by Henry the Eighth, modified by Edward the Sixth, remodelled by Queen Mary, and again protestantized by Queen Elizabeth, from whose reign the present oaths of office are principally derived. The scholarship oath is in the Latin language, but the English translation of it would begin with the following words:—

"I, N. N., swear and take God to witness, that I will embrace with my whole soul, the true religion of Christ; that I will place the authority of Scripture before the judgments of men: that I will take my rule of life, and the substance of faith from the word of God; that I will account as human other matters which are not proved from the word of God; that I will hold the royal authority supreme among men, and in no wise submitted to the jurisdiction of foreign Bishops; that I will refute with my whole will and mind opinions contrary to the will of God; and that in the matter of religion, I will prefer truth to custom, and things written to things not written; then that I will observe all the usages, laws, statutes, and laudable customs, which shall concern me, of this College; &c."

The 38th chapter of the statutes of Trinity College confers upon the Master and the eight Senior Fellows, the power of expelling from the college any fellow, scholar, or any other person living within the college, who shall be convicted of heresy or of a probable suspicion of heresy, and a similar punishment

* The petition of sixty-three liberal members of the Senate of the University of Cambridge, praying for the removal of tests from degrees in Arts, Law, and Medicine in the University, but without any interference with the Colleges.

of expulsion from the college is also appointed by the statutes for any of the fellows of the college who shall refuse to be ordained Priests, at the termination of seven years, after they shall have taken the degree of Master of Arts.

As the expressions in the cases of heresy and secular profession are almost identical, the expulsion of an heretical member from the college must follow the same rule with the expulsion of a fellow from the college, when he refuses to enter into Priest's Orders. But the lay fellow is merely required to relinquish his share in the college endowments, if he does not choose to enter into the clerical profession, and he always retains his right to vote for members of parliament as a Master of Arts of his own college, at the University elections.

In like manner, the heretical member can merely be excluded from the college endowments, and his right to vote for the representatives of the University in parliament cannot possibly be in the slightest degree affected by this ancient Elizabethan statute: he may therefore always remain a member of the general society of the college, but he cannot be a member of the endowed portion of the college, if the college authorities should exercise the full rigour of their power against him, by the letter of the ancient statutes.

At the present day, however, public opinion would be more likely to declare itself in favour of the martyr than of the inquisitors under such an obnoxious law, and most persons, who are admitted as scholars or fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge, hold whatever sentiments they may consider right, entirely independent of the ancient college statutes. Indeed the majority of the scholars have probably never read the college statutes, and may not wish to read them.

The principal duties of the scholars consist in reading the lessons in the daily services of the Church of England, in the college chapel, on which occasion one of the chaplains of the college reads all the prayers.

The audience, frequently consisting of large numbers of students, seldom attend to the service read, and their presence is only enforced by constant punishments and admonitions, and it is found that by far the largest quantity of college punishments are inflicted on the absentees from the chapel services.

In the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the college authorities appear to have been generally contented with the daily attendance of the students at an early morning chapel, and as the hour appointed for this service was five o'clock, this ancient rule might have been allowed to become obsolete, from its own impracticability.

Afterwards, however, an evening service was introduced into

the college chapels, possibly by the college authorities, and on the return of the Episcopalian party to power, in 1660, the Act of Uniformity was soon passed, in 1662, which declared:

"That no form or order of common prayers, administration of the sacraments, rites, or ceremonies, should be openly used in any church, chapel, or other public place of or in any college or hall in either of the universities, the colleges of Westminster, Winchester, or Eton, or any of them, other than what was prescribed and appointed to be used in or by the book of Common Prayer."

The use of shorter forms of prayer in the colleges is, however, now recommended by the Dean of Ely, as more advantageous to the cause of religion and good order; and the Dean most sincerely observes, that "those persons who have been most intimately concerned with the superintendence of young men at the University, will be best able to appreciate the painful measures which are not unfrequently necessary to secure regularity of attendance." In his opinion, "the substitution of a shorter service would remedy many evils of a very embarrassing and distressing nature."

The ostensible object for which the antiquated plan of compulsory attendance at prayers, in the college chapel, has been maintained, is to provide the means of forcing religion upon the notice of the students, an idea which justly belongs to the Elizabethan system of ecclesiastical tyranny, when the last Royal statutes were framed, and when persons of different religious persuasions were compelled to attend the services of the Church of England in their parish church.

Sermons are hardly ever preached in the college chapels, at Cambridge, and the ordinary services of these chapels, even when most decorously performed, are described by the Bishop of St. David's, as remarkable for their chilling languor, their general taciturnity, and their want of almost all the signs of a social worship. Many of the students in a large college are unacquainted with each other, and their inattention to the service is so manifest, that the same learned Bishop declares, that as far as his means of observation extend, the daily service of the college chapel is not a religious service at all, with an immense majority of the congregation, and that to the remaining few, it is the least impressive and edifying that can be conceived.

Indeed, the utter unsuitableness of this compulsory system of attendance at chapel prayers, in the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, for the promotion of a religious education, is so obvious, that it has attracted the attention of a learned foreigner, Professor Huber, of Marburg, who has recently published an ela-

borate German work on the English Universities. In the second volume of his critical remarks on the Universities, Professor Huber expresses his conviction, that the real result of the daily compulsory system of attendance at divine service in the college chapels is directly the contrary of what was intended, although that attendance is enforced by a severe college police, exercising constant control over the students, in the support of the literal meaning of the statutes, which ordain the attendance of the members of the college on these religious forms. The most frequent punishments, continues the Professor, which are inflicted in the colleges, were awarded in the last century for the absence of the students from chapel, and for disorderly conduct during service time.

This last source of trouble does not, however, exist, to any material extent, at the present day: it is the fashion for the students to conduct themselves in an orderly manner during the reading of the prayers, and college testimonials would be probably refused to any young men who persisted in disorderly conduct in the chapel; but the attendance of the students is frequently an act of self denial, and in the case of Roman Catholics, Dissenters, and Jews, it is necessarily, in many instances, a mere formality.

Whatever other changes may be effected in the chapel system, those young gentlemen who do not belong to the Church of England ought certainly not to be compelled to attend a service in which they cannot conscientiously join, and which they might even consider as a religious test, if the general system of inattention had not almost secularized this ancient religious service, and converted it into a portion of college discipline, to ascertain whether the students are constantly in residence at Cambridge.

When the celebrated petition of the sixty-three heroic members of the Senate of the University of Cambridge was presented to the House of Lords, in 1834, praying for the abrogation of religious tests on lay degrees, the petitioners declared their belief, as Protestant Christians, "that no system of civil or ecclesiastical polity was ever so devised by the wisdom of man, as not to require, from time to time, some modification, from the change of external circumstances, or the progress of opinion." These words illustrate admirably the plain state of the case; the ancient Universities are still governed by laws which belong to a bygone age; their forms, their oaths, and their declarations are not at all in harmony with the modern institutions of the reign of Queen Victoria, and the want of a thorough reform is the source of serious pecuniary loss to the Universities themselves, as numerous highly respectable Dissenters and Roman Catholics

still decline to trust their dearest earthly hopes to be led away from what they regard as a proper respect for the religious faith in which they have been educated.

Some concessions may be easily made on both sides, and as a commencement, perhaps none will be more acceptable than the extension of the degree of Bachelor of Arts, as the well-earned reward of scientific or literary merit at Cambridge; but at this point of academical education, the Church of England may require to be protected, and we should recommend that the provisions of the celebrated act of the 9th Geo. IV. chap. 17, for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, should be nearly followed in the degree of Bachelor of Arts, and that the form of the University test which is thus worded, "I, A. B., do declare, that I am a *bona fide* member of the Church of England, as it is by law established," should be changed into the following declaration, which is modified in order to admit Professor Sylvester, a Jewish gentleman, who was Second Wrangler in 1837, to his degree of Bachelor of Arts in Cambridge.

"I, A. B., do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare, that I will never exercise any power, authority, or influence, which I may possess, by virtue of the degree of Bachelor of Arts, to injure or weaken the Protestant Church, as it is by law established in England, or to disturb the said Church, or the Bishops and clergy of the said Church, in the possession of any rights or privileges, to which such Church, or the said Bishops and clergy, are, or may be by law entitled."

At the same time, we should rejoice if the excellent advice formerly offered by the learned Bishop of St. David's, to the Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, were adopted into an Act of Parliament, that the daily services of the college chapels should be discontinued, and that in their place, a weekly service should be established, with sermons, so as to afford the opportunity of real religious instruction to the young men who are members of the Church of England in that form to which they are most accustomed at home. In the opinion of the Bishop, the attendance of the students at these services in the college chapels ought to be purely voluntary, and the number present would of course be proportioned to the interest excited by the services there performed, and the sermons there preached.

So great is the desire for listening to sermons, at present, in Cambridge, that it is expected that a preaching room will shortly be built in the fellows' garden, within the walls of Trinity College, for the students who may wish to attend there.

Dissenters, who have hitherto gone to Cambridge, are de-

scribed by the Bishop of St. David's, as belonging to that part of the students, "which includes the quiet, the temperate, the thoughtful, the industrious, those who feel the value of their time, and the dignity of their pursuits. Such dissenters," continues the learned prelate, "we have had, and have now among us—I wish we had more of them: I should think the advantage of their presence cheaply purchased by any share in our endowments, which if all were thrown open to competition, they would be able to obtain."*

At the time when the Bishop wrote these words, he was himself a fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and he had then been for several years a tutor of the same college; but his bold declaration of liberal opinions on this subject obliged him to resign his college tutorship, and he has been subsequently rewarded for his moral courage, and his distinguished talents, with the far higher dignity of an episcopal mitre, and a seat in the House of Lords.

J. H.

* Letter on the Admission of Dissenters to Academical Degrees. Cambridge, 1834.

## Art. VI.—ON THE VALUE OF THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF PAUL; with an Analysis of his Doctrinal System.

### I.

There has been a disposition in some portions of the Christian world to depreciate the practical importance of the writings of the Apostle Paul. This has arisen in part from a dislike or indifference to doctrinal considerations, the moral element of Christianity being more clearly and simply announced in the gospels. With these views, however, we must confess, we are unable to sympathize. In every respect the life and writings of this eminent Apostle appear to us entitled to the deepest attention. They are, in the first place, the oldest, and the most undoubtedly authentic, monuments of the Christian faith. Secondly, they exhibit the earliest application of the principles of Christianity to the practical concerns of life and the administration of the Church. They place before us the circumstances of a time, when the facts of Christ's personal ministry and the impression of his life and teachings were still so fresh and vivid in men's minds, that the want of a biographical narrative, as a basis for faith, like that which ultimately called the gospels into existence, was as yet hardly experienced. Lastly, the epistles form an invaluable appendix to the gospels. The one would have been incomplete without the other. Archbishop Whately has observed, that Christ came into the world, not so much to be the *medium* of a revelation, as the *subject* of one. On first meeting with this observation we remember being greatly surprised at it. Nevertheless it will be found upon reflection to contain much truth, of which the evidence and the illustration may be discerned in the epistles of Paul.

In these writings there is little or no reference to the actions of Christ on earth. The Apostle's contemplation of him commences with his death and resurrection, and continually holds him up to view as a perfected and glorified man, dwelling with God in the heavenly state, final union with whom is to be made the object of the believer's aspirations and endeavours. Without the ministry of Paul, of which the epistles are the product and the record, Christ would have vanished from the earth, a beautiful but transitory phenomenon in the land of Palestine.

The characters of Christ and Paul leave a very different impression on the mind, and seem to belong to very different spheres; yet both filled their place in the great plan of providence, and were essential to its completion. The ministry of Paul consti-

tutes the first link in the chain which has connected the subsequent course of human affairs with the superhuman and divine in Christ. A medium was needed to bring these two principles, the human and the divine, into contact with each other. Paul's mind and character furnished that medium; and in this consideration lies the key to the right understanding and just appreciation of his writings. Christ stood far above the humanity of his own age and country, in a relation of fraternal sympathy to the humanity of all ages and all countries. His being a Jew was an unimportant accident in his history. He belonged to the world, and not to Judea. But Paul was altogether the man of his age, and lived in its ideas, its feelings, its necessities, its circumstances. His Hellenistic habits and education placed him on the verge of the Jewish and Gentile worlds, and enabled him to carry Christianity out of one into the other.

Under these circumstances, his writings were called forth, and directed in their application. In producing them he had not a thought beyond the immediate necessities of the time. It is Providence, and not the deliberate intention of their author, that has converted them into such fertile sources of instruction for successive generations through thousands of years. Hence are derived their highest excellencies—their evident unconsciousness of ulterior objects—their solemn earnestness—their deep sense of present necessity—their evidence of undoubting conviction. Now, a man thoroughly in earnest to produce a great change in his own time, cannot separate himself from the ideas and feelings of that time; they are the instruments by which he works; they furnish the only access by which he can reach the hearts and minds of his contemporaries. With the single exception of the specific object which he is seeking to attain—which distinguishes him among his contemporaries, which furnishes the great business and interest of his existence,—he is thoroughly one in feeling, opinion and conviction, with those among whom he lives. The popular life of his time thrills through his whole moral being; and his deep religious sympathy with its wants and its miseries, combined with the feeling, that God has given him the power to alleviate them—furnishes his inspiration, and endues him with the courage of a hero. The mind of such a man is not, and cannot be, that of a philosophical analyst. He cannot make the refined distinction of a later day, between the form and the spirit of a doctrine, or resort to the principle devised for him by the ingenuity of posterior theologians, of accommodation to existing prejudices. Every argument employed, every consideration appealed to, is to such a mind a reality, a truth; and it grasps it earnestly, and with deep conviction, as such. Strong

sympathy with popular feeling, and even with popular prejudice, except in the one point where change and reformation are immediately sought, seems to be an indispensable condition of rapid and extensive popular success.

Compare, for example, the different results that have attended the labours and writings of two very eminent men in the last century, Wesley and Priestley. The former addressed himself to the heart and conscience, and appealed for this purpose to convictions that were inherent, though slumbering, in the general mind. What has been the consequence? Myriads now bear his name, and exhibit in their numbers, their zeal and their organization, one of the most remarkable moral phenomena of the age. The latter, with the purest motives and the highest views, directed his instructions to the calm reason of mankind; went before his age instead of sympathizing with it; blended his religion with the speculative principles of a philosophical school, rather than with the feeling, the habitudes and the convictions, of our actual humanity: but, instead of leaving behind him a large and flourishing church, while he has scattered the seeds of extensive good, and excited impulses that must ultimately lead to valuable results, he has hardly created the materials for building up a sect.

Let us apply these general remarks to the case of Paul. His doctrinal system we shall examine in its details by and by; for the present we may assume it as a fact, which stands out conspicuous from his history and writings—that the great idea, which had seized and which governed his mind, and which he ascribed to divine revelation,—was the resurrection and ascension of Christ, to become the Saviour of Jew and Gentile who believed in him, and the expectation of his approaching reappearance from heaven, to raise the dead, to judge the world, and to gather the faithful into the kingdom of God. Possessed with this idea, Paul went out into the world. It was the animating principle of his whole being. It imparted its own spiritual fervour to the entire circle of his existing feelings and opinions, which seemed to furnish him on every side with illustrations of its importance and evidences of its truth.

We have no ground to infer from reason, or the language of Scripture, that any revelation ever has altered, or ever could alter, the intellectual conditions under which men's minds must admit and apply the influences of moral and religious truth, the forms and measures of which always bear a relation to the standard of the contemporaneous civilization. What we call revelation, seems rather the infusion of a divine strength into moral conviction and moral impulse—the direct quickening from

heaven into clearer consciousness, a more energetic life, and a purer form, of those fundamental principles of religious belief which are planted deep by the hand of the Creator in the original constitution of the human soul, than the distinct communication to the understanding of any fresh measures of objective truth; in other words, it is a moral rather than an intellectual influence.* If this be a correct view, the utterance of an individual, whether in speech or by the pen, under the influence of a revelation, must necessarily clothe itself with the opinions and feelings of the time—must come into operation and produce its effects through the medium of those opinions and feelings, without any clear and habitual consciousness of the distinction between that which is a divine impulse, and that which is only the human instrumentality through which it acts. Paul indeed appears occasionally to have been sensible of some such dis-

* In the New Testament we find nothing corresponding to the idea which our scientific theology has attached to the term 'Revelation,' as a *system* of new truths, accompanied by miraculous sanctions, and required to be admitted on that authority into the understanding; but rather, in the various passages, where either the verbal or the substantive form of the term occurs, the notion of a direct influence of the spirit acting on the mind in a particular instance—to determine the will, to suggest a thought, to strengthen a conviction, to disclose a view, or to place in a new light men's relation to God, to Christ, and to each other. Comp. Ephes. iii. 3, 5. Gal. ii. 2; i. 12. Rom. xvi. 25. Philipp. iii. 15. 1 Cor. ii. 10. Matt. xi. 25. Luke x. 21. Matt. xi. 27. Luke x. 22. The manifestation of a moral influence, Gal. i. 16. Very frequently the appearance of Christ from heaven at the last day is called ἀποκάλυψις. 2 Thess. i. 7. 1 Peter i. 7, 13; iv. 13; v. 1. Luke xvii. 30. In this sense, the last book in our Canon is called the Apocalypse.

The following observations from a French writer, though very different from the views usually entertained on this subject, may furnish matter for reflection, and certainly cannot be considered as sceptical in their tendency. "A toutes les époques critiques des sociétés il s'est fait de ces grands mouvemens d'idées dont rien ne rend raison, si ce n'est la force des choses, ou, pour mieux dire, la puissance de la vérité, qui se découvre d'elle même, et tombe vive et nue dans les intelligences qu'elle eclaire.—Il est peu de siècles qui n'aient eu leur révélation; mais c'est particulièrement au premier âge du monde qu'a dû se deployer plus naïve et plus pleine cette faculté de simple vue, cette intelligence d'un seul jet, dont l'homme dans sa nudité native avait un si pressant besoin.—Autrement la société, sans idées, sans ces idées vitales qui etaient nécessaires à sa conservation et à son etat, n'eût pu que se dépraver et perir. La première loi de son existence était d'avoir immédiatement des principes positifs d'action; il était de la sagesse divine de les lui donner en la constituant, de les lui donner par grace prompte et spéciale.—Le rôle de *revélateur* a dû succeder pour Dieu à celui de *créateur*. Comme père des lumières, il s'est fait sentir aux ames et les a inspirées: ainsi s'est passée la *révelation*, ainsi du moins l'entendons nous. Les idées venues par revélation sont essentiellement vraies—parce qu'elles sont la pure et simple expression des réalités qui les font naître. Ce ne sont pas des connaissances, quoiqu'elles aient de la vérité au fond: c'est plutôt de la poesie; elles en ont tout le caractère." *Damiron, Essai sur l'Histoire de la Philosophie en France.* Tom. ii. p. 241—44.

Might we not expect, that many difficulties in theology would be diminished, if the *psychology* of the religious principle were more thoroughly investigated? At present the prevailing notions of revelation and inspiration render such an investigation hardly possible.

tinction, but his language shows that he felt it was attended with uncertainty.* In fact, the unconsciousness of which we speak seems almost indispensable to that perfect sincerity and earnestness of mind without which there can be no success;—necessary to create an element of sympathy,—a medium of communication between the informing and the recipient mind,—without which zeal and eloquence would be consumed in vain. But this same circumstance, which is the cause and condition of immediate success, is the occasion of obscurity, and a source of error, when the instructions that flowed originally from inspiration, on being reduced to writing, become for distant ages a rule of faith and practice; for, while the moral necessities of mankind continue unaltered, the whole intellectual and scientific constitution of the mind has undergone, in the interval, the greatest change; so that the form and outward application under which important moral convictions are brought home to the mind and conscience, can no longer remain the same that they were two thousand years ago.

Our moral convictions have often to contend against the obstructions which imperfect knowledge and a reason oppressed with prejudice oppose to their free development. In moments of moral enthusiasm and religious inspiration, we catch glimpses of high and solemn truths, the full and unconditional recognition of which would compel an utter renunciation of many practices and some opinions, to which we mechanically and almost unconsciously conform, and from the influence of which we cannot deliver ourselves. Feeble and speculative minds are paralysed for great practical efforts by the consciousness of this invincible contrariety between what they sometimes perceive might be, and what they observe actually is. But the ardent and the energetic defy the inconsequentialities which they are perpetually encountering; obey all the convictions which come forcibly home to them, without inquiring whether, if pushed to their results, they would fully harmonize; and thus give effect and ascendancy to great moral principles, which, once rooted in society, outlive, cast from them, triumph over, and finally extirpate, the less perfect conceptions of God and duty, which in the first instance were sincerely and honestly associated with them, and without which they would never have obtained an entrance into the minds of men. We shall attempt to show hereafter, that there are some principles taught by Paul, and furnishing the vital power of his instructions, which, drawn out into their legitimate consequences, would prove utterly subversive of others, which he

* κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην· δοκῶ δὲ κἀγὼ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν. 1 Cor. vii. 40.

reasons from with the greatest apparent earnestness, and which we can see no reason to doubt were entertained by him with perfect sincerity. In the New Testament generally, but particularly in the writings of Paul, a consideration for the moral and the spiritual everywhere prevails over that for the philosophical and the speculative. The latter is left very much where the teacher finds it, resigned to those whose business is rather philosophy than religion, and is rarely appealed to, and then only in the habitual unquestioning persuasion of the time, for the illustration and enforcement of the former. It has been unfortunate for Christianity and the peace of the Church, that the process has been generally reversed in later ages.

There are some unavoidable inconveniences attached to the influence and authority of every religion which is founded on the interpretation of ancient writings, yet the absence of such writings would be attended with far greater evils than any which may occasionally result from the misuse of them. If God has ever communicated a divine spirit to the minds of men, and given a divine impulse to the course of human affairs, the influence of that spirit and impulse can be perpetuated through future ages, and the form and character of civilization be permanently moulded by it, only through the existence of authentic monuments recording its origin and earliest operations. The idea of a Church or communion of believers and worshippers implies the existence of a doctrine and an example, which they consider to be derived from God, and consigned to the preservation of a book, which they agree to recognise as the fountain of their moral life, the source of their faith and principles. Without such a standard to appeal to, and left to the ordinary influences of reason and nature, the experience of ages may convince us, that men would find no medium between the vague and powerless speculations of philosophy, and the rude conceptions of the multitude, now sunk in the grossest fetichism, now disguised by a licentious poetry, or wrought perhaps at length by an artful priesthood into an instrument of spiritual domination. If mankind are ever destined to realise the beautiful idea of an universal brotherhood, dwelling in peace, and in the grateful acknowledgment of an universal father—there exists no means of conducting us to so happy an issue, but the gradual determination, with the progress of learning and free inquiry, of an enlightened, uniform and self-consistent principle of interpretation, to be applied to the sacred writings, which are the source of our religious ideas, combined with the general diffusion through society of that truly fraternal spirit which the adoption of such a principle would naturally inspire.

Instead therefore of complaining that the faith of mankind

has been made dependent on the interpretation of ancient and obscure books, we should recollect that this is the unavoidable condition of having any access at all to the mind of Christ without the exercise of a constant and stupendous miracle: and while we admit the errors and abuses to which this constitution of our spiritual condition has given rise, we should not forget that such errors and abuses are in themselves neither unavoidable nor invincible; and direct our attention in future, to the first means of obviating them.

We may notice three periods in the historical development of Christianity: first, during the two first centuries, when faith was nourished by preaching, fresh from the primeval fountain of apostolical earnestness and zeal, and while the Christian Scriptures, which were to form the future mind of the Church, were only gradually coming into existence: secondly, after the completion of the canon and the development of the hierarchy, when the Church became the only authorized interpreter of the Gospel; when the faith of Christendom was determined by the decrees of councils; and the multitude, shut out from all access to the Scripture, derived their notions of religion entirely from the traditions of the clergy; thirdly, after the Reformation, when the Bible in Protestant communities was submitted to the free examination of the learned, and appealed to as a final authority in matters of faith, coupled, however, with the assumption of its plenary inspiration, and the belief that an entire and self-consistent system of doctrine could be constructed out of the comparison and combination of the whole mass of its multifarious contents. In the first of these periods, we witness the fervour and simplicity of an unlearned and popular faith, taking strong hold of men's consciences and hearts, and busying itself, but remotely and gradually, with the deeper questions of philosophy. In the second, we are made aware of the mischievous effects of an irresponsible priesthood, overwhelming with its traditions and decrees the original truths of the Gospel, and upholding throughout Christendom, an uniformity of doctrine, discipline and ritual. In the third, we notice the application of an artificial learning to the Scriptures, for the purpose of extracting from them a dogmatic system, that should embrace every question of practical wisdom and religious belief.

But new wants have made themselves felt during this third period, and new means have been devised for meeting them. With the progress of knowledge and free inquiry that has marked every century since the Reformation, an increasing difficulty has been found in reconciling all the views deduced by a fair interpretation from every part of Scripture, with the

discoveries of modern science, and with the principles of a more refined ethics and a more enlightened philosophy. Rigid orthodoxy indeed has all along maintained its original position, and given up nothing to science and philosophy, maintaining, on the assumed ground of plenary inspiration, that the truth of God must always be preferred to the speculations of men. But for the last two centuries there have been men in all parts of Protestant Europe sincerely attached to Christianity, and fully appreciating the inestimable benefits it has conferred on humanity, who plainly saw that the question could not be thus summarily disposed of—who were anxious to effect an amicable adjustment between the claims of faith and reason—who desired to conciliate the natural and healthful progress of human ideas, with an undiminished reverence for those hopes and principles which Christianity had introduced into the world.

This feeling gave rise to the system of accommodation, as it has been called, according to which the inspired preachers of the Gospel were supposed to have adapted their language to the prejudices of their hearers, and to have employed, by way of figure and illustration, the popular conceptions of the time without themselves entertaining them. It must be observed, that the whole of Protestant theology has emerged out of a strong belief in the plenary inspiration of the Bible. Even the freest forms of it, as, for example, the Socinian, have been distinguished by a deep reverence even for the letter of Scripture. We might almost say, that a rigidly Scriptural Christianity is the outward mark and sign of Protestantism. What was felt or perceived to be true in morals, in philosophy, or in religion, it was assumed must be found whole and entire within the limits of the Sacred Volume. On this system, then, only one of two alternatives seemed left to the believers; either an implicit acquiescence in the literal interpretation of the words of Scripture, taken in their unforced and obvious sense, without any regard to its irreconcilableness with the conclusions of modern science and philosophy; or else the supposition, that the Sacred writers had veiled the truths they taught in language adjusted to the low and imperfect education of their contemporaries. They were said to avail themselves of *Jewish* modes of speech, to make impressive and intelligible their *Christian* doctrines. Their words, it was contended, appeared to state one thing, but the real meaning of them involved another.

Great violence was in this way frequently offered to the natural construction of the text; and it was not always perceived, that an idea was rather put *into* words, than fairly extracted *out* of them: but this was the only method in which it was deemed

possible to maintain the authority of Scripture, and to uphold in any sense the notion of inspiration. A more plausible method of overcoming the difficulty was next suggested, in the distinction which it was affirmed might be drawn between that which the apostles delivered from inspiration, and that which they said under the feelings and with the knowledge of ordinary men; and in accordance with this view, the principle of interpretation approved by Paley was laid down, that we should admit the *conclusions* of the Apostles, and not regard their *arguments*. But we find, on trial, that it is not so easy to draw the line which is here suggested. Conclusions and arguments perpetually run into one another with a continuity which it is impossible, at any assignable point, to dissolve. In fact, propounded in this loose and unguarded form, the principle throws open the Bible to the license of every dogmatic interpreter. For all that accords with his own views he will be ready to claim the sanction of divine authority. Whatever is at variance with them he will not hesitate to reject as a mere form of speech, which forms no essential part of the doctrinal system of Scripture.

It will be readily conceived, that the Epistles were that portion of the New Testament which was most severely subjected to this species of critical dissection. Their multifarious contents furnish the most abundant materials for dogmatic controversy; their practical application of Christian principles to the earliest circumstances of the Church deservedly confer on them great interest and importance; and the difference between the Apostles and Christ might seem to excuse and justify a freer treatment of their writings than would have been deemed consistent with the reverence due to the words of the Saviour himself. For this reason, the Epistles—especially the Epistles of Paul—with the Gospel of John, which possesses a similar dogmatic character, and perhaps owes its origin to similar circumstances—have ever been—and will no doubt continue to be—the principal field on which the battle of a controversial theology must be fought; till the awakening of a spirit more calmly and deeply religious shall call men back to the essentials of Christianity, and dismiss polemics to the receptacle into which time finally sweeps all useless and exploded things.

No part of the New Testament is fraught with deeper interest than the Epistles of Paul,—revealing to us, as they do, the earliest development of the organic life of Christianity: there is none, as to the meaning and application of which it is perhaps more difficult to arrive at a completely satisfactory conclusion. Three courses seem open to us, and have been pursued by three different classes of inquirers:—First, That of the orthodox, who

rest in the system deduced from a literal interpretation of the Apostle's words,—and who, regarding this system as the characteristic and peculiarity of Divine Revelation, and shrouding its more difficult features in the veil of mystery, do not think it necessary to establish the conformity of their scheme with the principles of natural religion and human philosophy, or to maintain the coherence and consistency of all its elements with each other, when wrought out into their legitimate consequences. Secondly, That of those who consider Christianity as a completion and supernatural sanction of the truths of natural religion, and the resurrection of Christ in particular as a confirmation of the doctrine of a future life, of which the evidence from reason and nature is not so clear and convincing as could be wished. This is the system generally adopted by Unitarians, though not exclusively by them: those who adopt it, recognise the religion of nature as it offers itself to the reason of man, and refer to it as a standard of the truths taught in Scripture; whatever interferes with their conceptions of the teaching of reason and nature being explained into mere phraseology, and rejected from the substance of revelation. Thirdly, That of the Deist, who, admitting the correctness of many of the orthodox interpretations, but regarding as fundamental and indubitable the principles of natural religion, and being unable to reconcile the two, on the system usually embraced by Christians, concludes that Christianity itself must have had its source in imposture or fanaticism, and is nothing more than a lasting delusion.—With the first of these courses—speaking now with exclusive reference to the Epistles of Paul—we cannot concur, because some of the doctrines inculcated by orthodoxy, and which are perhaps justified by a literal interpretation of texts, would, if carried out into their consequences, appear to us not only at variance with the clearest principles of ethics and natural religion, but altogether irreconcilable with other, still greater and more vital, doctrines undoubtedly taught by the Apostle himself. As to the second, we must confess ourselves dissatisfied with several interpretations generally received among Unitarians, because they seem to us to put a meaning into the Apostle's words which they do not naturally bear, or perhaps more frequently do not admit the entire force which is fairly deducible from those words,—often resolving into a form of speech, or a Jewish illustration, what we cannot but regard as the expression of deep and living conviction. With the Deist we cannot agree, because there is to our minds strong evidence of a divine power —a superhuman influence and operation—in the life and teachings of Christ, for which we can find no adequate cause in the

circumstances of his age and country, and which we are compelled therefore to refer to the direct inspiration of God. It was this same divine power, influence, and operation—proceeding from God through Christ—which we believe to have passed into the hearts and minds of the Apostles, and to have been the spring of their enthusiasm, and the cause of their success, enabling them to implant a new spirit in the corrupted manners and institutions of the world, and to become the creators of a new civilization. This same power, acting through faith and love on the heart and conscience, has, as we believe, in all subsequent ages of the Church, produced the truest heroes, sages, and philanthropists—has softened manners, ameliorated laws, and spiritualized art, literature, and philosophy; and having made a new world in Europe, is now scattering the seeds of a higher culture in the distant regions of the south and west. The whole of European history, since the fall of the Western Roman empire, with the present tendencies and prospects of society, we cannot but regard as a clear declaration of the will of Providence, and a confutation of Deism.

What then, it will be asked, is essentially Christianity? and how are we to discover, amidst the various contents of its original records, that element of divine life, which has produced these great effects, and which is still burning in the heart of the great fraternity of Christendom? This question, simple as it may seem, has never yet been completely answered; it furnishes the great problem which theology has yet to solve. Its solution is limited by the three conditions which we have already suggested. It must avoid the irrational and immoral consequences of orthodoxy; it must renounce the strained interpretations of the rationalist systems; it must escape the unsatisfactory negations of Deism. Within these limits its solution must somewhere be found. Different solutions will be offered by different minds; and none may completely satisfy all the conditions of the case; but all are entitled to attention which are offered in the spirit of truth and seriousness, and which furnish an approximation to the desired result.

No one ever wielded the divine life and power of Christianity with greater success and purer integrity than Paul. Let us endeavour to ascertain, from an analysis of his writings, what it was that he taught, without any reference to our modern theories: that analysis may perhaps lead us to the secret of his moral influence, and enable us to separate the spirit of his religion from its form.

We shall now place before our readers, deduced immediately from his own writings, and conveyed, as nearly as possible, in

his own words, the doctrinal system of Paul, on the great topics of God, Man, Christ, and the Future Life. Possessed of these views, we shall proceed in a concluding article in our next number, to compare them with our actual state of manners, knowledge, and opinion, and so endeavour to determine their present significance and practical application.

## II.

Systematic theology is an idea that sprang up subsequent to the original promulgation of the Gospel. The only unity that we can reasonably look for in the teachings of the primitive missionaries of the faith, is that which arises from their consistent exemplification of the great principles by which they were inspired, their unwavering trust in the promises of which they were the heralds, and their steady prosecution of the practical objects of the Christian dispensation. Called forth by circumstances, adapted to the condition and capacity of the parties immediately addressed, and clothed in a form in which effect and impressiveness were more consulted than the scientific enunciation of abstract truth—the teachings of the New Testament can be reduced to anything like systematic unity, only by tracing them back to the primary convictions in which they had their source, and viewing them all with a common reference to the grand topics of apostolic instruction and testimony. Nevertheless, the authority which attaches generally to the declarations of Scripture—the distinct and definite shape in which the tenets of different churches are conceived and expressed—the desirableness of ascertaining, in order to judge of the comparative claims of those tenets, what primitive Christianity both in spirit and in form actually was—and the great importance more particularly of the instructions of that Apostle who carried the Gospel out of the narrow circle of Judaism into the wide community of heathens—seem to impose on us the necessity of carefully studying his writings, and of extracting from them as complete and systematic a statement of his doctrines as the nature of epistolary composition will admit.

As his writings are all occasional, and the notion of a doctrinal system never probably entered his mind, we must ourselves construct a scheme with reference to those topics on which the Apostle was led most constantly and most emphatically to insist, and arrange the several passages of his Epistles under the heads thus suggested to us; and by this artificial distribution of the contents of his writings, we must mould them into a shape which will admit of an immediate comparison with our present modes of representing religious truth. Every text

that is of importance in the writings of Paul may be brought under one or other of the four following heads:—1. God; 2. Man; 3. Christ; 4. The Future Life. It may sometimes be necessary in quoting the texts that bear upon each of these points, to observe in what period of the Apostle's ministry the Epistles from which they are taken were probably written—as some critics have affirmed, not without probability, that, on a comparison of the earliest and the latest of the Apostle's letters, a development in his ideas respecting some of these topics may be clearly traced.*

In every religious inquiry, the two prominent considerations are those concerning God and Man. The conception of their nature and mutual relation determines the character of the religious belief; and, in Christianity, is a necessary pre-requisite to clearly understanding the person and office of the being who acts as mediator between them.

I. We begin with God. The strict monotheism of the old Hebrew theology is assumed as a basis in all the reasonings of Paul. It is not so much made a subject of positive instruction, except in a few cases of direct appeal to the Gentiles, where the absurdity of polytheism is strongly pointed out, as it is everywhere tacitly assumed and argued from. Implicitly, however, and indirectly the most important truths are clearly taught respecting the nature, power, and character of God, and his relation to the moral world. It would be tedious to recite all the texts that might be alleged under each of these heads. We will briefly state the result of a careful and repeated examination; and quote a few only of the more striking passages in proof of our affirmations.

(1.) The *nature of God.* Paul teaches distinctly, that he is one, supreme, unsearchable; living and true; alone possessed of immortality; dwelling in unapproachable light; giving all things, and receiving nothing in return; author of all things both good and evil. That one sublime text in the Epistle to the Romans, (xi. 33—36,) may suffice as an illustration of the monotheistic doctrine of Paul: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counsellor? Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and

* The three Pastoral Letters, as they are called, (First and Second to Timothy, and that to Titus) are the latest of the writings ascribed to the Apostle: next to them must probably be placed the Epistle to the Philippians.

through him, and to him, are all things; to whom be glory for ever." *

(2.) The *power of God.* He is all in all; the kingdom will be finally delivered up to him; he has full and uncontrollable power over the work of his hands, and can dispose of it as he will—just as the "potter hath power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour;" he saves us according to his own free grace and eternal purpose; and the spirit by which our hearts are renewed comes from him.†

(3.) The *character of God.* He is a Father, who has not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation. Everywhere God is designated by Paul as our Father, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. He has adopted us in Christ, and put his spirit in our hearts, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. "To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him." He is freely and gratuitously merciful, long-suffering, righteous, and just. He has concluded all in unbelief, that he may have mercy on all. He will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. "After that the kindness of our Saviour God, and his love towards men appeared—according to his mercy he saved us."‡

(4.) *God's relation to the moral world.* Everything emanates from him. His will is plainly manifested by the light of nature against all unrighteousness. Christ's ministry was according to the will of God our Father. Paul was predestined to the ministry from his mother's womb by the grace of God. Eternal life is God's gift. He qualifies us for the inheritance of the saints, and rescues us from the power of darkness. Saints are predestined to the adoption in Christ from the foundation of the world by the good pleasure of God. The saints are God's work, created to good works in Christ.§

If, then, we collect into one view the substance of Paul's doctrine respecting God, it seems to resolve itself into the idea of a Being, absolutely one, supreme, and uncontrollable—quite distinct from, independent of, and superior to, the material universe—the source from which all things proceed, and on which

* 1 Thess. i. 9. Rom. xi. 33—36. 1 Tim. ii. 5. 1 Tim. iv. 10. 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16. Titus i. 2, 3. 2 Thess. ii. 11.

† 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. 2 Cor. v. 18. Rom. ix. 21—24. 2 Tim. i. 9. 2 Cor. i. 22.

‡ 1 Thess. v. 9; ii. 12. Gal. iv. 6, 7. 1 Cor. viii. 6. Rom. iii.; xi. 32. 1 Tim. ii. 3, 4; ix. 10. Titus ii. 11; iii. 4—7.

§ 2 Thess. ii. 13. Gal. i. 15; i. 4. 1 Cor. ii. 2 Cor. iv. 6. Rom. i. 18; vi. 23. Coloss. i. 12, 13. Ephes. i. 5; ii. 8, 10.

all things depend—responsible to no one, everything entirely submitted to his will—but exercising these high functions in the character and with the spirit of a Father. Paul's idea of God, as opposed to the exclusiveness of the Jews—is that of the equal and impartial Father of Jew and Gentile;—as opposed to the superstition of the Gentiles, it is that of one, indivisible, and supreme Deity;—as contradistinguished from the pantheism of heathen priests and philosophers, it is that of a Being, who has an existence, a power, and a will, with which nothing can come into competition, to which everything is subjected, and which would still subsist unchanged though the whole of creation were annihilated.

II. Such is Paul's conception of God. What does he teach respecting Man? This head divides itself into two parts—respecting the *Jew*, and respecting the *Gentile;* and further, *before*, and *after*, conversion. First, let us speak of the *Jew;* and *before conversion*. According to the Apostle, the Jew in this state lived under a law, which he describes as a curse and a bondage; which gave the knowledge of sin, but no power to vanquish it. By the deeds of the law, the Jew could not be justified. The strength of sin lies in the law; and it is sin which gives its sting to death. Yet, while the law subsists, obedience to it is essential to the divine favour and blessing. After the announcement of the Gospel, all are threatened with the wrath of God, who do not repent and believe. Hence the external privilege of a Jew is unavailing. The majority of the Jews are allowed to remain unbelieving for a time, to afford the Gentiles an opportunity of entering the kingdom of God.* These views express a fundamental truth, viz., that mere law is unavailing to human peace and salvation,—modified in its application by a controversial object,—the proving that Jew and Gentile stand on the same footing before God, and equally require the justification of faith.

The *Jew after conversion.* He is justified by faith; *i. e.*, by trust in Christ, as the image and representative of the Father, which includes the spirit of holiness and love. He is hence a new creature, bought with a price, and redeemed from the curse of the law. He has passed his season of pupillage, and has attained to the majority of an heir, and is adopted by God in Christ. He is now possessed of all things, puts on the Christian armour, and waits patiently for the future coming of Christ. His state in general is that of having passed from bondage, fear and death, to liberty and hope, and everlasting life; from the sense

* 1 Thess. i. 10; ii. 16; v. 9. Gal. ii. 1 Cor. xv. 56. Rom. ii. Coloss. i. 21. Philipp. iii. 9. Rom. xi.

of guilt and the dread of punishment, to the consciousness of forgiveness and reconciliation with God. The images of an earthly Messiah which had filled his mind, are converted into the spiritual conception of a future reigning with God and good men in heaven.* After conversion the condition of Jew and Gentile becomes almost identical. We have here selected the few points which are more immediately peculiar to the former. Moreover, the complete understanding of the condition of man after conversion, encroaches on the consideration of another question, which we cannot enter upon in this part of our inquiry —viz., Paul's doctrine of the Future Life.

We pass on, therefore, to the Gentiles; the consideration of whose condition and prospects, *before* and *after* conversion, is to us more interesting and instructive than that of the Jews, because it more nearly coincides with that of mankind in general. The Apostle's doctrine respecting them in their *unconverted* state is this. They have a moral law written on their hearts—a conscience that bears witness within them: and are without excuse when they sin, because the will of God is clearly manifested in the works of his hand. From not choosing to retain God in their knowledge, they have been given over to a reprobate mind, and abandoned to all immoralities. Having thus consciously and voluntarily done things worthy of death; having walked after the course of this world; having changed the truth of God into a lie, and served the creature more than the Creator;—they have become fit subjects of the divine displeasure—vessels of wrath prepared for destruction; and, in their natural condition, are the children of wrath; for the wages of sin is death. The unconverted state of the heathen is called "the old man with his deeds." † The general inference deducible from these views of the Apostle, we may state in the following terms. All wickedness results from a voluntary and intentional transgression of the divine commands. Hence men bring punishment on themselves, and have nothing to expect on the ground of debt, but all on the ground of mercy and favour. Before the preaching of the Gospel, the world was sunk in such a depth of wickedness, that a sentence of divine condemnation must have been pronounced upon it, but for the gratuitous interposition of divine mercy.

There are some particulars in which the condition and pros-

* 1 Thess. iv. v. 2 Thess. iii. Gal. iii; iv. 5, 6. 1 Cor. iii. 16, 21, 23. 2 Cor. v. 17. Rom. v. Coloss. ii. 20. Philipp. iii. 9. 1 Cor. vi. 11, 20. 2 Cor. vi. 14, 18. Rom. v. 1—11. Rom. viii. Coloss. i. 22.

† Rom. i. 28.—παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν. 32. Whole chapter an illustration of this topic. Rom. ix. 22. Ephes. ii. 1 Cor. vi. 11. Ephes. iv. 34.

pects of Jew and Gentile may be contemplated under a common point of view: to these we shall now briefly direct attention. And first, *before conversion.*—Those who obstruct the conversion of others, bring wrath on themselves. All men are sinners. All that are under the elements of the world, are in the condition of slaves. The works of the flesh exclude from the kingdom of God. Christ is the savour of death to them that perish. The God of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the Gospel should not shine in unto them. All have sinned, and were morally dead; therefore Jew and Gentile must not judge one another. True circumcision is that of the heart. The carnal mind is death. Men make themselves enemies to God by their wicked works.* *After conversion.*—Christians are predestined to become such, from the foundation of the world. They are called and elected by the free grace of God; reconciled to God by the blood or death of Christ; made friends with, and brought nigh to, God; delivered from the present evil world, and from the wrath to come; justified by faith; sanctified by the spirit; born again; a new creation; sealed by the spirit to the day of redemption; waiting patiently for the appearance of Christ from heaven; planted into the death and resurrection of Christ—dying with him that they may live with him; for, if they die, they shall live, and, if they suffer, they shall reign, with him. They are no longer their own, but bought with a price, entirely God's—purified unto him, as a peculiar people, zealous of good works.†

Such, then, is Paul's doctrine respecting God and man, and their relation to each other. The mutual relation of God and man is the fundamental idea on which the superstructure of every religious system must rest. Let us endeavour to place distinctly before us, in phraseology with which we are familiar, what the Apostle teaches on these subjects. We may observe, in general, that his views are altogether broad and popular,—adapted to the conceptions of the multitude,—calculated for impressiveness and effect on the heart and life. Those mysteries and apparent contradictions which are inherent in the nature of the highest questions in theology and philosophy, and which have their

* 1 Thess. ii. 16; i. 10; v. 9. Gal. iii. iv. 1—4; v. 19—21; vi. 8. 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. 2 Cor. ii. 16; iv. 4; v. 15. Rom. ii. iii. v. viii; ix. 22. Col. i. 21.

† 1 Thess. i. 4, 10; ii. 12; iv. 7; v. 2 Thess. ii. 13; iii. 5. Gal. ii. 15—21; iii. 28, 29; iv. 1—7, 19; v. 6, 23; vi. 8. 1 Cor. i. 7, 8; ii. iii. 16, 17, 21, 23; vi. 1—6, 9, 10, 11, 20; vii. xiii. 2 Cor. ii. 16; iii. 18; v. 15, 17, 18, 19; vi. 14, 18. Rom. iii; v. 1—11; vi. viii. ix. 24; xii. xiv. Coloss. i. 21, 22, 23; ii. iii. Ephes. i. 4, 5, 20; ii. 13, 17; iv. vi. Philipp. iii. 9, 10, 11, 21. 1 Tim. i. 5. 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12; iii. 15. Titus ii. 12, 13, 14.—Christians, a peculiar people, (λαὸς περιούσιος).—iii. 5, 7. 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

source in the inadequacy of our understandings to measure the views of Infinity—the Apostle leaves where he finds them, without attempting a solution; and may even be thought, in his zealous enforcement of practical considerations, to bring gratuitously into view the metaphysical inconsistencies, which the vast and awful themes on which he touches seem to involve. He never assumes the language of a speculative philosopher. His example instructs us, that religion should be kept distinct from philosophy; that those plain and practical considerations, which interest our moral feelings and influence the direction of the will, should never be confounded with speculations which tax unavailingly the highest intellects, and reproduce in every age the same questions and the same efforts to solve them, without leading to any positive result. This just and obvious distinction was soon lost sight of, even in the early days of Christianity. The wild theories of the Gnostics had their origin in a forced and unnatural union of Christian faith and heathen philosophy.

Of God, Paul very plainly teaches, that he is the Supreme Fountain of all things, good and evil, and that nothing can exist independent of his will. His doctrine springs from the fundamental idea of the Hebrew monotheism, as distinguished from the dualism of many Oriental religions, and is in fact identical with that of Isaiah (xlv. 7.), "I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things." Paul does not shrink from some of the most startling consequences of this view of the divine omnipotence. He has full power over his own work to make vessels of wrath or vessels of mercy. (Rom. ix. 21—23.) Men are predestinated by him to the good which awaits them. (Rom. viii. 28—30. Ephes. i. 5.) God sends into the minds of unbelievers a spirit of delusion, that they should believe a lie. (2 Thess. ii. 11.) This language evidently originates in the same conception of human relations to God as that according to which, in the Old Testament, God is said to harden Pharoah's heart. Second causes and intervening instrumentality are altogether forgotten in an overwhelming impression of the universal agency of the First Cause.

On the other hand, in regard to Man, Paul teaches, as plainly and as distinctly, the doctrine of his full moral responsibility. Both Jew and Gentile knew what was right, and justly brought on themselves the divine wrath. Both are pardoned, altogether of grace. This doctrine, it must be admitted, if pushed into all its consequences, we cannot, in the present state of our knowledge, reconcile with the other, taught by the Apostle, of

the universality of God's dominion, and the uncontrollable supremacy of God's will. In fact, as we have already observed, the Apostle has left untouched the deep problem of the compatibility of human responsibility with the omniscience and omnipotence of God. He has merely given utterance to two of the profoundest convictions of the human heart, which cannot be eradicated from it, and which we unconsciously act upon, in spite of our reasonings,—viz., that God *is* omnipotent and supreme, and that man *is* responsible for his actions: and to these two convictions he has given the practical application, which the great objects of the Christian dispensation pressed upon his thoughts. He has appealed to them, in the fulness of his own religious feelings, as grounds of trust and motives to holiness, —perhaps without perceiving—certainly without noticing—the logical incongruity, which a metaphysical intellect might discover between them. But in so acting he has proved himself a true practical philosopher. He had a moral—not a speculative —object in view; and he has fixed men's attention on those considerations only which have a positive bearing upon it.

It must often happen, in some of the most important questions of belief and opinion—that facts present themselves, which it is impossible to deny, and in regard to which it is even necessary to adopt a practical conclusion—whose relation to each other, and to the general order of creation and providence, we are wholly unable to discern, and must wait to have revealed to us, with expanded intellects, in some higher order of being. Our existence is a progression; no great truths are revealed to us all at once; perhaps the greatest will be the last made known, because they are the most difficult to apprehend. We must never forget, in studying the writings of Paul, that his office, as a Christian Missionary, was rather to show men their way through the darkness of this probationary state to the kingdom of heavenly light, than to unfold, prematurely, those deep mysteries of our spiritual being, which have no immediate relation to conduct and happiness, and which, perhaps, even the light of the future world will suffice but slowly and gradually to reveal.

As to the condition of the Jewish and Gentile worlds, *before* and *after* conversion—Paul represents both as reduced, by the abuse of their free agency, to a state of moral impotence, which, while it precluded the hope of any spontaneous renovation springing up among themselves, did not exempt them from a just liability to the punishments of a neglected and disobeyed God. Out of this state, when they could plead nothing of debt or of justice, they were gratuitously raised by the free mercy of

God, in the way which he saw fit to provide for their salvation. This restoration was effected—not by the inculcation of any new moral code—not by the provision of any fresh instrumental services and assistances, a new temple, a new ritual, or a new priesthood—but by the infusion of a new spirit into their decayed moral nature—quickening into new life convictions that were dormant—opening before them new hopes and expectations—and making them fully conscious of the filial relation, in which, as Christians, they were placed towards God. They were translated by these new agencies, operating on their hearts, from the service of a world of sin and death to the preparatory discipline for a world of perfect holiness and everlasting life.

Here, as in the former case, the views of the Apostle are set forth in so popular a form, and with so little regard to philosophical precision, that, if carried into all the consequences logically deducible from them, they might seem to involve some metaphysical inconsistencies, which, in our present state of advancement, it would not be very easy to remove. Why, it may be asked, should God have endowed man with a moral nature capable of such abuse, as to lead to a state in which self-renovation becomes, practically speaking, impossible,—and in which those born into it are, through the crimes of former generations, exposed to influences which disqualify them for rising out of it? and why, moreover, should *they* only enjoy the privilege of deliverance from a state which draws after it wretchedness and death—upon whose hearts the quickening influences of Christianity have been predestined to fall?—We can only reply, that the Apostle has dealt with the plain facts of human nature and divine providence, without involving himself in metaphysical theories concerning their relation and mutual consistency. The experience of life is, however, in accordance with his teachings. We behold every day on all sides of us, myriads of human beings sunk in an abyss of crime and profaneness, out of which they possess no ostensible means of extricating themselves, and which yet entails on them, in accordance with the moral economy which pervades the divine works, much positive suffering and a still greater loss of happiness. And in that state they continue —till the spirit of religious awakening, passing over them, fans into a more active life the yet unextinguished spark of moral consciousness—till, repenting, believing, and turning to God and duty, they become capable of instruction, desirous of improvement, and intent on fulfilling the ends of their existence. In fact, in all of us, faith is the spring and principle of moral progress. Till God and our relation to him are vividly realized

by us—the heart is cold, the will is feeble, and duty is only a mechanical service. We none of us want *knowledge* so much as *power*: and even our capacity of increasing religious light—the clearing up of those doubts and difficulties by which faith is sometimes embarrassed, and the attaining to a state of peaceful harmony with ourselves and with the world—depends far less on additional instruction imparted to the intellect, than on the right constitution of our feelings and affections, derived from a holy and filial trust in God. These are facts of daily experience and observation; and they are in unison with the teachings of the Apostle; but they come rather within the view of religious wisdom than of philosophical speculation.

Religion fixes our attention on things as they exist around us, and as we see them, in order to lead men through them, in a course of progressive moral discipline, to a higher state. Philosophy speculates, as to what things may be, in the eye of God—in the final issue of events—in those universal relations which bind all things in heaven and on earth to each other. The one fixes our mental eye on the positive realities of the finite, as the steps through which we must gradually ascend to the infinite. The other, in its eagerness for universal truth, transcends at a bound the limits of the finite, and attempts to grasp at once the infinite. Both these operations of the human mind are healthful and natural in their place. Both come out and discover themselves with the gradual unfolding of our nature. Both answer important purposes of intellectual and moral discipline.—But they are quite distinct, and should be kept to their proper spheres; and the final harmony which subsists, and will at length be discerned, between them—must not be looked for in a premature anticipation on earth, but among the remote results of the progressive development of an immortal and ever-improving soul.

We may, perhaps, go a step beyond this, and affirm that there are elements in the doctrinal system of Paul which, fully developed and carried out into the whole extent of their legitimate consequences, lead to conclusions, which take us beyond the limits of that which is actually revealed, and place us above the point of view under which the Apostle, with a practical reference to present effect and impressiveness, has set forth the condition and prospects of human beings. Paul, for example, asserts the moral death of the unconverted, and the necessity of Christian regeneration; and yet in the same system of which these doctrines form a part, he inculcates, with the utmost clearness and emphasis, the free mercy and paternal character of God. This

is the vital principle of his system, the growth and activity of which, in minds that fully submit themselves to its influence, will ultimately expel from it all less perfect conceptions, with which it may at first have been unavoidably associated, and clear it from every feeling and idea which sullies with a breath of human narrowness and imperfection the pure and unclouded brightness of the Father's love.

III. The most interesting part of Paul's doctrinal system is that which relates to Christ and the Future Life. First, let us speak of Christ. We may reduce our inquiry respecting him to three heads, under each of which we will arrange the substance of the Apostolic teachings. *Who* is Christ? *What* has he done for men? *How* has he done it?

(1.) *Who is Christ?* A man—born of the seed of David—the antitype of Adam, standing in the same relation to the new and spiritual, as Adam to the old and natural, creation—the image of the invisible God—the firstborn of the creation—Lord over all, rich unto all who call upon him—in him, through him, and for him, have been founded all things both in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible—he is before all things, and in him all things consist—he is the beginning, firstborn from the dead, that he may be first in all things—the head of the body, which is the Church—in him dwelleth all fulness—the fulness of the deity bodily, (*i. e. really, actually,* not as by a *shadow,*)—head of all principality and power—placed at the right hand of God, above every name that is named in this and the future world—all things put under his feet—head over all things to his Church, which is his body—corner-stone of the holy temple of believers—mediator between God and man—a ransom for all—the mystery of godliness, manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen by angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.*

* 1 Cor. viii. 6. 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22, 45. Rom. x. 11, 12.—*ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος πάντων.* The most obvious reference here is to Christ; *ἐπικαλούμενος* is the very term used in Acts vii. 59, where Stephen invokes Jesus to receive his spirit. Coloss. i. 13, 17, 27; ii. 9, 10. Ephes. i. 20, 23; ii. 20. 1 Tim. ii. 3—6.—*ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ, πάντων.* 1 Tim. iii. 16.—*τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι, ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις, ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ* (*edit. Lachmann*). This passage appears to contain an enumeration of the most important incidents in the mission of Christ—his human birth—his baptism—his transfiguration—the sending out of his Gospel into the world, (comp. Matt. xxviii. 19) and the reception of it—his ascension. It must not, however, be forgotten, that the first Epistle to Timothy is distinguished by many inexplicable peculiarities, so that Schleiermacher decidedly, (*ueber den sogenannten ersten Br. des P. an T.*) and Neander more doubtfully, (*Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der Christlichen Kirche, etc., p.* 400, *note* 1,) have questioned its authenticity.—2 Tim. ii. 8, 10. 2 Cor. v. 21. Philipp. ii. 5—11.

Now what is the general result of this Apostolic representation of the person of Christ? That, although a man in nature, his perfect virtue made him the image of the invisible God; and that, when raised after death to the right hand of God, he was placed at the head of the spiritual creation, filling a rank inferior only to God, dispensing all spiritual gifts to his Church, which derives its power and vitality from him—reigning till all his enemies shall be subdued, when his delegated authority must be surrendered to God.

(2.) *What has Christ done for men?* Died for their sins—redeemed them from the wrath to come—called them to the kingdom of God—our only foundation—the first fruits of them that sleep—died for all, that man might live a new life in him—end of the law for justification to every one that believeth—lived and died, that he might be Lord of the living and the dead—through him we have redemption—descended and rose again, that he might fill all things with his spirit, and give gifts to men—led captivity captive—gave himself an offering and a sacrifice—though in the form of God, took upon him the form of a servant, emptied himself, and submitted to the death of the cross—though rich, yet for the sake of men became poor—therefore, exalted above every name, the whole creation acknowledging him Lord—came into the world to save sinners—abolished death—brought life and immortality to light—redeemed men from iniquity—purified to himself a peculiar people—saved men through the washing of regeneration and the renewal of the holy spirit. *—The substance of what Christ has done for men is this: he has delivered men from the bondage of law, sin, and death, and put them in possession of spiritual freedom, a renewed moral nature, and eternal life.

(3.) *How has Christ done this?* By his death and resurrection he has broken the power of law—believers crucified with Christ have a new life through him—being made a curse for us, he has bought us off from the curse of the law—God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not imputing to men their trespasses—God made the sinless Christ sin, that men might become the righteousness of God in him—Christ became poor, that men through his poverty might be made rich—set forth as a mercy-seat or propitiation, through faith in his blood—deliver-

* 1 Thess. i. 9, 10; v. 9, 10; ii. 12. Gal. i. 4.—*τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.* iv. 1—4. 1 Cor. i. 30; iii. 11; vi. 11; xv. 3.—*ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφάς καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη. καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς.* xv. 2 Cor. ii. 11, 16; iii. 6, 9, 14, 16; v. 15. Rom. x. 4; xiv. Coloss. i. 14.—*ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν.* Ephes. ii. 2, 5, 6, 10; iv. 8—12; v. 2.—*προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ.* Philipp. ii. 6—10; iii. 10, 11. 1 Tim. i. 15. 2 Tim. i. 9, 10; iv. 1. Titus ii. 14; iii. 5.

ed up for man's transgressions, and raised for their justification —procured for men the reconciliation or atonement received through him from God—as Adam's transgression placed his posterity in the condition of sinners, so Christ's perfect obedience puts all his followers in the condition of the righteous—men redeemed, reconciled, saved, by the death or blood of Christ—his death and resurrection brought man a new spiritual life—condemned sin in the flesh—his spirit maketh alive—abolished ordinances by nailing them to his cross—triumphed by his cross over principalities and powers—gathered together all things in earth and heaven under one head.*

The result of Paul's doctrine respecting the *mode* of Christ's agency may be thus stated: Christ's voluntary humiliation, sinless obedience, submission to the cross, and resurrection from the dead,—broke the power of evil, and enabled him to found a spiritual kingdom independent of, and superior to, the temporary institutions and evanescent distinctions of this world,—into which, through repentance, faith, and newness of life, Jew and Gentile would be equally admitted.

IV. The ministry of Christ, perpetuated by his Apostles, was chiefly prospective,—intended to prepare men for the Future Life. Their teachings imply, that a crisis was approaching, in which he would save those who put their trust in him, and leave the unbelieving to their fate.—Three questions here present themselves:—*Where, when,* and *how*—will be this Future Life?

(1.) *Where?* Christ will descend from heaven to raise the quick and the dead—the then living and the risen dead shall be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and to be for ever with him—the living shall not anticipate the dead—Christ shall transform the bodies of men into a likeness to his glorified body. Rom. viii. 18—23, compared with 2 Peter iii. 13, and Rev. xi. 15, seems to imply that all this will take place in a renewed and glorified world.†

(2.) *When?* The time is nowhere exactly defined. The day will come, as a thief in the night, but still the language implies, shortly—for the Apostle says, it is better for men, in expectation

* Gal. ii. 15—21; iii. 13; v. 6; vi. 14. 1 Cor. xv. 56, 57. 2 Cor. i. 22; v. 16, 17, 19, 20, καταλλαγήτε τῷ θεῷ (N.B. The movement must proceed from ourselves) 21; viii. 9. Rom. iii. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26; [Being justified freely (δωρεὰν) by God's grace through the redemption in Christ, ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. What other meaning can attach to these words—whether ἱλαστήριον be taken literally, or as Heb. ix. 5, in the sense of "mercy-seat"—than that the trust or confidence of the believer (πίστεως) should be founded on the propitiatory efficacy of Christ's blood?] iv. 24, 25; v. 9, 10, 11, 12—16, 17—21; vi. vii. viii. Coloss. i. 22, 23; ii. 12, 15. Ephes. i. 7, 10; ii.

† 1 Thess. iv. 15. 2 Thess. i. 5—10. 1 Cor. xv. 50. 2 Cor. v. 1—9. Rom. viii. 18—23. Coloss. i. 12, 13. Ephes ii. 5, 6. ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. Philipp. iii. 20. —ἡμῶν τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς—ἐξ οὗ, etc. iv. 3.

of it, not to marry and encumber themselves with the cares of this life. Before its approach, the man of sin must first be revealed, and a great falling off from the truth take place.*

(3.) *How,* under what circumstances, will this great and awful event occur? God will destroy all his enemies, and take vengeance in flaming fire on the unbelieving and disobedient—the spirit is the seal and pledge of men's preparation for this event—Christians must therefore cherish the fruits of the Spirit—no immoral person shall enter the kingdom of God—there will be a spiritual renewal of all things, when Christ enters on his reign—flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven—believers will be changed, clothed with incorruption and immortality, and will reign with Christ, judging the world and angels (1 Cor. vi. 2, 3,)—eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him, in that future age—there Christ will reign, till he has subdued all his enemies, when he will surrender the kingdom to God, who will become all in all.†

Let us now briefly review and collect together the several results of our inquiry into Paul's doctrine, respecting God, Man, Christ, and the Future Life.—We have seen that he teaches, concerning God and man—that God is omnipotent and man responsible; and that God and man, through the latter's disobedience, were at variance. Between them Christ interposes as a pacificator, yet not as a third party independent of either, but as connected by the closest ties with both—an elder brother of the human family, the firstborn of the sons of God,—the being, whose perfect virtue and universal obedience prove an union of the divine and the human nature to be practicable,—through whom therefore the moral harmony of creation is restored. In connection with this view of Christ's mediation, the genuine doctrine of Hebrew monotheism still maintains its complete ascendancy. The whole mission and agency of Christ is represented as having its ultimate source in the pure and gratuitous love of the Father towards the human race. "He spared not his own son, that with him he might freely give us all things." "He hath justified us gratuitously." "Our salvation is not of debt but of grace." "It is the free gift of God."

* 1 Thess. v. 2. 2 Thess. ii. 3—9. 1 Cor vii. 26—33; x. 11. Upon us have come *τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων.* 1 Tim. vi. 14, 15. Titus ii. 13.

† 1 Thess. v. 23; v. 6—8. 2 Thess. i. 5—10; ii. 3—9, 11. Gal. i. 4; ii. 15—21; vi. 7, 8. 1 Cor. i. 7, 8. 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. 1 Cor. xv. 18, 50, 51—53, 57. 2 Cor. v. 10. Rom vi. xiv. Coloss. i. 13; ii. 10—12. Ephes. i. 13, 14; iv. 30. Philipp. iii. 10, 11, 21. 1 Tim. vi. 14, 15. N.B. *ἐπιφάνεια* is here used of Christ's appearance in the *future æon.* 2 Tim. i. 10, of his appearance in the *present æon.* 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8. Titus i. 2, 3; ii. 13; iii. 5—7.

When Christ departed from this world, and the gross and carnal expectations of his earliest followers were dissipated by the circumstances of his death and resurrection,—a new power gradually took possession of their minds, and they began to conceive of Christ and his kingdom, under a more spiritual point of view. This was exclusively the view which occupied the mind of Paul,—the individual who, above all others, effectually introduced and permanently fixed this higher conception of Christianity. Paul had never known Christ after the flesh. His intercourse with him had been solely of a spiritual nature; all his references to Christ, and reasonings about him, relate to his risen, exalted and glorified state. This consideration will serve to throw some light on the Apostle's views and reasonings. He perceived, that a new leaven was beginning to work in human society, which tended to absorb into one mass the originally distinct elements of Heathenism and Judaism, and to form out of them a purer, a more religious, and a more brotherly union among men. Of this great change he regarded Christ—the Christ who had conferred with him in visions, and whom he believed to be continually employed for the well-being and happiness of man amongst the agencies of the spiritual world—as the source, the principle, and the instrument.

What then was the condition under which the Apostle saw the unconverted portion of mankind everywhere suffering? Slavery to oppressive law and vicious custom—fear springing from the consciousness of guilt—the power of evil habit—misery and death;—and all this wretchedness, the consequence of prolonged disobedience,—since, according to Jewish notions, natural and moral evil were regarded as inevitable concomitants of each other, and as springing from a common root. With these facts, daily presenting themselves to his view, were associated in the Apostle's mind the strong popular persuasions of that day, which modified his conception of them;—first, the belief in an evil spirit continually opposing the divine plans; and secondly, the belief in the efficacy of propitiations and atonements with God. These two persuasions had struck a deep root in the Jewish mind of that age: and in a modified form, they were also essential elements in the prevalent belief of the heathen world.

Let us then consider the actual position in which Paul now stood; the work before him—the subjects on which it was to take effect—and the convictions of his own mind, which furnished the sole instruments for executing it. Without such a miracle, as would have unmade at a stroke the

whole mental constitution of that age, and reversed the accumulated impressions of centuries—it was not possible for a mind like Paul's, earnest, ardent, and practical—not that of a speculative philosopher, but of one, who habitually lived and wrought amidst the warmest popular sympathies and the most stirring popular interests—to free itself wholly from the influence of notions, which formed a part of the intellectual patrimony of the time, and which it had imbibed, and made one, with its earliest religious convictions—saving in the one single point, where it had received immediate impulse and direction from heaven. Deprived all at once of such notions—however in themselves irreconcilable with the future conclusions of a more advanced philosophy—the known laws of human nature would lead us to expect, that the mind of the Apostle must have lost no small portion of its vital earnestness and strength: its point of living contact with actual humanity would have failed;—the cold, clear, powerless light of the intellect might have been there, but the creative energy—the vital heat—of the moral nature, would have been wholly wanting.

What chiefly demands our gratitude in the contemplation of this momentous crisis of human history—what lifts our thoughts above the world to that Supreme Intelligence, who conducts all its movements, and uses men as his unconscious instruments—what compels us, in the most enlarged sense, to regard Christianity as his work—is the way in which that Intelligence employed the popular notions, which belonged to a particular grade of mental cultivation, as a medium for introducing into the human mind more perfect and enduring conceptions, which have worked powerfully and silently in its hidden depths, and are at length beginning to triumph over and expel the less pure elements, with which they were originally associated.

The power of simple-hearted truthful goodness, to vanquish sin and death, to rise superior to slavery and fear, and to secure the favour and blessing of God—this is the great truth, which was at the bottom of the Apostle's soul, which the image of Christ had deposited there; but which he brought out and applied—perhaps himself with only an imperfect knowledge of the whole extent of its application—in the form, and under the limitations, and with the immediate reference to existing opinions, which the circumstances of society and his own sincere convictions spontaneously suggested to him. Fear, slavery, sin, and death—these were the workings of the evil one, which crushed and degraded humanity; the redemption of men from this moral thraldom was the object of Christ's ministry, and the means of peace and union with God.

How, then, does the Apostle conceive of Christ, as effecting this redemption? All these evils Christ himself encounters and goes through; he passes through them unhurt. He comes into immediate contact with evil, and yet triumphs over it;—poverty, ignominy, suffering, he submits to with calm and patient trust; the whole law he fulfils, yet with the consciousness that the law must finally be done away;—tempted like other men, he stands forth a model of perfect righteousness; he cheerfully encounters an agonizing death, but only as the passage to a higher life. The reward of this successful conflict with evil was the glory and felicity of heaven. Christ vanquished the evil one; broke his sceptre; and drove him from his dominions.—The effect of the whole conception is to place in strong contrast the transient evils of the present, and the lasting glories of the future, world; to exalt the spiritual above the material, the eternal above the temporal; to inculcate the great truth, that the painful and arduous discipline of this life should be used as a means of wisdom and purification—of preparation for a higher state of things to come. If, in the calmer view of our present advanced civilization, the contrast should sometimes seem to be overwrought, and to favour the excitements of a fanatical enthusiasm, we must make allowance for the glowing conceptions of a new faith, in the progress of its earliest triumphs: we must remember the need of strong present effect and impressiveness—and that state of deep moral corruption in which the mass of mankind were then sunk, and out of which nothing but the most powerful excitement could have availed to raise them.

With the more general views which modified the Apostle's conception of the mission of Christ, was blended the deep and uneffaceable notion of sacrificial propitiation. No one at all acquainted with the history of opinion can have failed to notice, how deeply this notion pervades the religious belief of antiquity. In itself, it is not to be reconciled with the pure doctrine of the fatherly character and gratuitous mercy of God; since it supposes him to do that, in consideration of suffering voluntarily incurred, which otherwise he would not or could not have done. But the fatherly character of God is, after all, the essential element in the religious system of Paul, which sacrificial notions only served to introduce into minds else unprepared to receive it, and which was destined, finally, to extricate itself by its inherent vitality from every notion originally associated with it, by which its force and purity were impaired. This great principle of Christianity the Apostle brought home to the minds of his contemporaries, by the following considerations. Men were far gone in sin, and had deviated widely from the will of God.

He was displeased with them and wroth. The life and death of Christ, constituting, from the incessant conflict with evil which they involved, one prolonged sacrifice, (his death being the crown and completion of his sufferings,) propitiated God. Accepting the sacrifice of Christ, God admitted all who relied on its sufficiency to the fulness of his paternal mercy. He himself devised this means of reconciling a sinful world to himself. And, this sacrifice once made, no others were necessary again. It was a complete, final, all-sufficient, propitiation. The love of Christ in dying for the world, and the simple reliance on himself, which, under God, he constituted the means of justification,—superseded for ever the sacerdotal observances of less perfect forms of religion—abolished the sacrifice, destroyed the temple, and abrogated the priesthood. For the painful and fruitless endeavour to obtain justification by entire conformity to the requirements of an outward law, was substituted the inward justification of a mind reconciled to God by faith and the spirit of love.*

* It is impossible to disguise the difficulty which embarrasses this subject of atonement and propitiation. The radical idea involved in it is closely mixed up with all the earliest representations of Gospel teaching,—as well in the Evangelists (Matthew xx. 28. λύτρον ἀντὶ. [1 Tim. ii. 6. ἀντίλυτρον.] Mark x. 45. Matthew xxvi. 28. John vi. 51.) as in the epistles of Paul, John, and Peter, and in that to the Hebrews,—and seems to enter to their very substance. All the religions of antiquity are deeply imbued with the same notion; and those forms of Christianity which have put it forth most prominently in their doctrinal system, however we may deem them chargeable with error and extravagance, have been uniformly distinguished by the power and decision of their spiritual influence. This idea therefore, whatever we may think of it metaphysically, must certainly possess some latent affinity with very deep wants and tendencies of the human soul, which divines of a certain school have passed over with undue neglect, and which a more thorough acquaintance with the psychology of religion would probably set in a clearer point of view.

On the assumption, that this idea is metaphysically inconsistent with the full recognition of the paternal character of God,—the suggestion has been thrown out in the text, that in the preaching of the Apostles it was an idea of the time, a form in which their thoughts spontaneously clothed themselves, and that it thus served as a medium for effectually introducing the latter doctrine into the general mind. To this subject we shall probably recur again in a subsequent article; but in the meanwhile we wish the suggestion alluded to, to be regarded in no other light than as one of those thoughts, which furnish a temporary resting-place for the mind in its way towards a complete and satisfactory determination of opinion.

It has been argued, that as atonements, under the old dispensation, with one slight and seeming exception, were only available for the removal of ceremonial impurities, while moral transgressions, till otherwise atoned for, remained under the full penalty of the civil law and the Divine displeasure,—the consideration of Christ's death as a sacrifice could only have been figurative, since it did not in fact correspond to the Mosaic type, and that therefore it would not have included the idea of a real propitiation. But there is an obvious reason, why no society could have allowed any breaches of morality, which were fit subjects for public animadversion at all, to be compounded for by the observance of a mere ceremony. Order could never have been maintained in the state under so lax a system of penal justice; and the foundations of morality must have been destroyed by the sanction of such easy methods of satisfying the conscience. The civil power must have felt too deeply its own responsibility to per-

In Paul's doctrine of a Future Life, we find the same involution of a spiritual and eternal truth in the conceptions of a particular age, which we have noticed in other of his doctrines. Paul viewed the Gospel as the only means of spiritual redemption and moral purification, and consequently as the only preparation for the happiness of the future world. Holiness was the condition of salvation; but holiness he regarded as unattainable, in that age, without the spirit of the Gospel. Hence the promise is to them only who believe and obey. They only have admission into the heavenly kingdom. With regard to the rest of mankind, the system of Paul decides nothing as to their ultimate state; they are left by it to uncovenanted mercies. The Apostle's vision is here indistinct and dark. He sees only the light that was immediately revealed to him; in that light he rejoices, and to that he confines his eye. He rests in the simple, practical conclusion, that disobedience and wickedness must be punished, and that all the works of the devil and his angels will be finally destroyed. The effect and impressiveness of his doctrine

mit such a state of things; and even under a sacerdotal government, the priesthood would in this case have assumed the functions of the civil magistrate. If, after undergoing the penalty of the law, and satisfying the claims of justice, the offender had been further required to offer in the temple a religious atonement, such a demand might have subjected the sacerdotal authority to invidious animadversion, and would certainly not have increased its influence or its popularity. — It does not however follow from this unavoidable necessity of civil society, that, when human relations came to be considered under a *religious* point of view,—as in the preaching of Christianity,—the notions of propitiation, which a sacerdotal order and ritual kept constantly before the mind, might not have great influence in modifying the conception of them. Nor is this inference at all weakened by the earnest expostulations which we find in the Prophets, on the uselessness of sacrifices, without clean hands and a pure heart. We meet with similar sentiments among the poets of the heathen; though the whole of their public and private life was based on the idea of a propitiatory intercourse with the Gods. 'Immunis aram si tetigit manus,' &c., (*Hor. Carm.* iii. 23, 17.) is the only passage which we can immediately call to mind; but many such will occur to the classical student. Such instances only exhibit the momentary reaction of good sense and natural feeling against the influences of a sacerdotal form of religion, which may at the very time have been acting most powerfully on the general sentiment of the community.

Fully to understand this question in its connection with Christianity, we ought to know what ideas had grown up, and penetrated into the belief of the Jews, in the centuries preceding the preaching of the gospel,—especially among the Rabbins, who were the formers of the public mind. Gfrörer says (*Geschichte des Ur-Christenthums*, I. viii.) that the idea of expiation for the sins of the guilty, by the merits of the righteous, prevailed in the old synagogue,—sometimes associated with the notion of sacrifice, but less frequently, after the destruction of the temple, in consequence of the disuse of sacrifices,—that nevertheless great importance was always attached by the Jews to the expiatory efficacy of the sacrifice of Isaac. Gfrörer's statement is confirmed by that of Jost, who observes (*Geschichte der Israeliten*, B. III. 6. ix.) that a Rabbin was often reverenced by the people like God himself, and that it was believed a Rabbin could expiate by his prayers and death, the sins of the people, so that at last, not only the judicial power of the Sanhedrim, but the atoning efficacy of the High Priests was believed to be lodged in the Rabbins.—The feelings entertained towards a Rabbin would be naturally transferred by Jewish Christians to Jesus.

depended, probably, at the time, on its being limited to this one view. Its relation to the wider views of a humane and religious philosophy, coming into existence at a later day, under the inspiration of other and deeper doctrines of Christianity, it did not fall within the limits of the Apostle's vocation in this life to contemplate. The necessity of distinguishing between the form and the spirit of a doctrine, appears clearly from the Jewish conceptions in which Paul clothes his representation of the future life—as a reigning with Christ, judging the world, and judging angels;—as also from his evident expectation, that Christ would shortly descend from heaven, arrayed in all the outward pomp and majesty of a judge, to raise the dead, and to summon the quick and the dead to his tribunal. This is evidently but the material form in which his own sincere convictions, sympathizing with the state of public opinion, led him to invest the spiritual doctrine of future retribution.

We have thus endeavoured to exhibit, as nearly as possible in the language of the Apostle himself, his doctrine concerning God, Man, Christ, and the Future Life. It will at once be perceived, how necessary it is to make a distinction between the *form* and the *spirit* of his teachings; and that, although our first duty is to ascertain, without regard to doctrinal conclusions, what it is that the Apostle actually taught, in the form that brought it home to the convictions of his contemporaries—yet that, when that task of simple interpretation has once been performed, another task remains, more difficult but equally necessary, imposed upon us by the law of progressive development to which God has subjected the operations of the human intellect—that of determining the relation of the form of the apostolic doctrines to our present modes of conceiving moral and spiritual truth—of distinctly recognizing amidst various outward forms, necessarily changing with the progress of human nature itself, the presence of the universal and eternal spirit of divine truth.

J. J. T.

## Art. VII.—THE QUESTION OF MIRACLES.

1. *The Mission of Jesus Christ;* a Lecture, by Thomas Wood. London: John Green.
2. *Anti-Supernaturalism Considered;* a Sermon, preached at Stamford-street Chapel, in reference to a Lecture preached at Brixton, by the Rev. Thomas Wood. By William Hincks. London: John Green.
3. *Jesus Christ our Teacher and Lord by Divine, not by Self-Appointment;* a Sermon, by Joseph Hutton, LL.D. London: John Green.
4. *The Question of Miracles;* a Lecture, by Philip Harwood. London: Charles Fox.

There is a growing tendency with those who favour the idea of *progress* in Religion, to resolve the whole question of Christianity into the manifestations of God, and of His will for man, incorporated in the person and the life of Christ.

Their view is that Christ is Christianity,—that the man is the Image of God,—the only adequate symbol of things divine,—that the revelation of Deity is in the harmonized elements of the mind of Jesus,—that the revelation of Duty is in the specimen of the perfect man,—that the revelation of Destiny is in the picture that is given of a completed human Existence, in the connections of a filial spirit with God whilst upon the earth, and its ascension to Him, as to its natural home, when freed from that flesh and blood which cannot inherit the kingdom of God. The passage of Scripture which most fully expresses their views of Christianity *as a Revelation* is, "the Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us,"—and if the lower Criticism had left undisturbed the beautiful expression "God manifest in the flesh," the higher Criticism would have had no inclination to evade it. To this class of disciples all the interest, all the light of Christianity is in indissoluble connection with the person of the Christ. They protest against an abstract Christianity, a set of propositions containing truths, precepts, duties, collected from the New Testament, and called the Religion of Jesus. Christ *in them,* is their hope of Glory. They value the evangelical narratives chiefly because they enable us to recreate the living Jesus,—to bring our own souls into personal intercourse with the soul of Christ. They cherish every 'Word' he uttered,—but chiefly because it gives vividness, force, completeness, to their conceptions of his individual mind. They treasure every record of his 'Works,'—but

chiefly because it enables them to reconstruct his character, to give Life to their Ideal, and to make the disciples of these latter days, sharers in the privileges of those whom his look could move into tears, and on whom his presence left a spiritual mark and hue, so that men took note of them that they had been with Jesus.

We profess to belong to this class of Christians. We take this opportunity of saying that this is the idea of Christianity with which we wish this Periodical to be identified. We believe Jesus to be the Teacher and Leader of Humanity, "not by self-appointment but by divine appointment,"—and in consistency with this belief we value the Scriptures, chiefly as they enable us *to know the Christ*. We acknowledge nothing faultless but the character of Jesus, nothing divine but the soul of Christ. The Gospels are not Auto-biographies. The Scriptures contain the representations which *other* minds have received and given of Christ,—faithful, we believe, as a record of impressions, but not infallible as a record of facts. "The light of the knowledge of the glory of God was in the face of Jesus Christ, but *we* have received this treasure in earthen vessels." From the hints and sketches, the words and works, preserved in the Scriptures, to make distinct the Image of God, "to travail in birth until Christ is formed within us," is the great work of Christian Discipleship. This is our highest duty to the Scriptures,—and the highest aid we derive from them. They are not systematic statements of Christian Truth, they are not Christianity reduced to words,—but mainly elements out of which to renew the living impersonation of Man's duty and God's providence, Jesus Christ himself, who, as the perfection of humanity under its earthly condition, is necessarily "the same yesterday, to day, and for ever." "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." "No man can come unto the Father except through me." These two sentences contain our entire view of Christianity as a revelation of God, and a revelation of Duty.

We may be asked, in what does this differ from the common view of Christianity entertained by those who profess themselves the friends of religious freedom? We should be glad to believe that there was no difference; but we cannot. There is among all protestant believers in revelation a vast deal too much of what Coleridge called "Bibliolatry." Christ is not the Revelation,—but the Bible is the Revelation. Not the divine Original,—but the human impressions and representations of it are what men worship. The Scriptures which should lead them to Christ, they substitute for Christ. The traces he left of himself on minds of the most various make, they insist on regard-

ing as parts of their own faith, and the essentials of salvation. Instead of ascending from the effects to the cause, they insist on stopping with the effects ;—and they regard the impressions produced by Christ on the minds of Paul, or Peter, or John, as divine as the mind of Christ himself. Not Christ as seen in himself, but Christ as reflected from minds the most different from his own, is their complex and heterogeneous Christianity. All this is abundantly indicated in that much-vaunted saying, "the Bible is the religion of Protestants,"—and thus the Book is substituted for the Christ. Not the unity of a perfect mind, to which we ascend from the traces it left of itself on imperfect beings,—but these traces themselves, this secondary intercourse, this multiform reflection, these complex effects produced by the one pure ray of truth falling on the misty elements of Jewish mind, are all confused together, and identified with the unity of the Image of God. Protestants in general maintain, not the perfection of Christ only, but the perfection of the writings of his first followers, and profess to find, doctrinally and morally, a complete unity in the Christian Scriptures. *They* say, you must receive the books, and harmonize their statements: *we* say, you must receive the Christ, and harmonize his character. The Scriptures enable us to conceive *him* who *is* the revelation. The religion that is represented by the unity of a perfect mind is clear, consistent, forcible, all-sufficient. The religion that is to harmonize at every point, with the multifarious contents of the writings of the first disciples, who will undertake to embody into one consistent conception? Again we say, the one Christ, and not the many impressions of him, is the Religion we profess.

The friends of *progress* in religion have naturally allied themselves to this idea of Revelation. The Religion which is embodied in a perfect mind cannot be exhausted. The image of God in humanity, like God himself, is an inexhaustible provision, for the spiritual education of imperfect man. It is the divine conception, however, not the verbal statement of the views and feelings it excited when he who realized it first came into the world, that is universal and inexhaustible. A religion reduced to words and propositions, is necessarily bounded, limited, incapable of giving out new light as man advances. But the traces that a perfect mind leaves of itself, may for ever lift nearer to its own perfection the kindred mind that studies and loves them. God and his Christ become known to us by the signs and traces we possess of their own spirits; and thus there is the closest analogy between the manner in which the perfect God is more and more revealed to the filial and understanding heart in Nature and Providence,—and the

perfect Christ in his words and works. We trust no one will think we are disparaging the Scriptures by thus exhibiting the relation they bear to our knowledge of Christianity. They enable us to rise to the conception of "God manifest in the flesh,"—and that conception is our Religion.

It has been a perhaps not unnatural consequence of this view of Christianity, that, the Image of God in man being the only essential part of it, as soon as that conception has been obtained, many minds have relieved themselves from all philosophical difficulties respecting the origin and history of the Revelation by taking refuge in this grand result. In the fountains of their own souls, not in dogmatic statements or historical records, the saving Ideal dwells,—and when they have collected it from its outward and documentary vehicles, they drop the embodying narratives as non-essentials, the character and the difficulties of which they are not bound to consider and explain. The Christ is formed within them. The Books contain many things, which, whether true or false, are perplexing and doubtful. The one is the essential spirit. The other is but the unessential form,—why encumber themselves with its difficulties, its discords, its marvels? This appears to us an easy and indolent inclination of mind which ought not to be indulged.

We are not at liberty to receive Christ as divine and perfect, and yet blink the question as to how his mind was formed. If he is not divine and perfect, he does not represent the Religion of universal man; *if he is*, is he an accident in the world's History, or is he the specially, the providentially, and to all intents and purposes, the preternaturally formed Image of God? Either he is the natural product of the circumstances in which he appeared,—or he is the product of Miracle, that is, of a special Providence. Now assuredly those who receive Christ as divine and perfect, if they reject the accounts of the origin of his mind, which the Christian records contain, are bound, in some other way, to account for the phenomena. They are not at liberty to say, we accept the perfection and the divine mission of Jesus,—but we will not encumber ourselves with the question of his natural or preternatural relations to God. Is he their Image of God? Was he designed to be so by God? If these two questions are answered in the affirmative, then the extraordinary, the miraculous formation of the Christ is conceded,—though this or that miracle of the Evangelists, or all of them together, may be rejected. We can conceive no greater inconsistency than for a man to accept of Christ as divine and perfect, and yet to deny the supernatural formation of his mind; and if he is not divine and perfect, we know not in

what sense any man can profess to follow him as his Teacher and Leader up to God. Perfection has nowhere been the *natural* condition of humanity; and a being whose *imperfections* we are capable of discovering, cannot be our Representative of God. In what sense then do they who deny the miraculous formation of Christ's mind profess Christianity? Do they think that *perfection* could appear in man without special Providence? Or do they relieve themselves from the necessity of miracle, by acknowledging some imperfection, and professing a Christ who is not the full image of God?

Not the supernatural, however, in relation to the formation of Christ's mind, but the supernatural as *evidence*, miracles worked for the purpose of producing belief and conviction in the divine authority and commission of the Miracle worker, have been the chief sources of difficulty. We must distinguish between the supernatural wrought by God on Christ,—and the supernatural wrought by Christ for the purposes of evidence and self-manifestation. It is very possible to reject the latter, yet retain the former. It is a possible state of mind,—we doubt whether it is a philosophical and consistent one. For in such a case these two questions present themselves. First, if you separate from the manifestations of Christ every miraculous incident, if you limit your picture of him within the conditions of the natural,—is there absolute necessity for resorting to Miracle in order to account for his existence? If nothing supernatural proceeded from him, is there evidence in his views and character alone, that *he* proceeded from the supernatural? For ourselves we feel that the moral and spiritual manifestations of his mind are so bound up with the miraculous, that it is impossible to effect a separation,—and that if you take away the miraculous from the Gospels, you have no longer the means of constructing that Image of Perfection which forces the mind upon God as its only possible Original. The second question that arises in the case supposed is this—how do you account for the character of the Books that preserve for us all that we know of Christ? If there was nothing of miracle connected with him, how do we account for the miraculous texture of the only notices of him we possess? How did the present Histories of him grow, and come into existence, and exclude all other accounts, if they are formed upon a fundamentally false supposition? This complicated literary and historical question, those who separate Christ from the miraculous, whilst they accept him as perfect and divine, are bound to settle in some probable or possible manner.

Mr. Wood, in his lecture on the mission of Jesus Christ, has

rejected the miraculous from Christianity, without attempting any explanation of the moral, literary, or historical phenomena. Miracles, his reason cannot admit; yet the Christ he considers perfect and divine, "the chosen servant of Almighty God." The difficulties of the formation of such a being; the difficulties in separating the natural from the supernatural, in the only delineations of him we possess; the difficulties in accounting for the miraculous character of the earliest records of Christianity, and of arriving at the truth if these are framed upon a false view; the difficulties connected with the effects wrought by Christianity on Jew and Gentile,—these Mr. Wood silently passes over as though he was not conscious of their existence. His soul accepts the moral Christ: his reason refuses miracles. He takes what he likes; leaves what he dislikes; and burdens himself with the explanation of nothing. Now we think that this is not the way in which so grave, so profound, so momentous a question should be discussed from the pulpit. It was due surely to all the literary, historical, and philosophical difficulties that stood in the way of Mr. Wood's view of Christianity, and to the judgment of Christendom at large, that some attempt should be made to establish it by unanswerable arguments, and to harmonize it with the actual facts and phenomena, which are the conditions into consistency with which any view must be brought, before it can earnestly and honestly be maintained. We are surprised that a public teacher should treat the connection of Christianity with miracles, as if it was a question of taste, to be decided by tact or feeling. His intellectual palate does not relish miracles; and therefore miracles are not.

"Hoc volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas."

Let any one who pleases trouble himself with the elucidation of the historical phenomena: he is better employed. And we the more lament this slight and slighting treatment of the actual facts of the question, because we have great sympathy with the *spirit* of some of Mr. Wood's views, and are not by any means disposed to grant to his opponents that miracles hold that peculiar relation to Christian discipleship which they incline to assign to them. We ought to distinguish more exactly between the philosophical and the religious question. What is the origin of Christianity?—miracle?—or is it within the natural laws of providence? This is a question of history, philosophy, intellect. Does the soul acknowledge Christ as the Image of God, and follow him without power of resistance, as that blessed being who has brought peace into the world by the union in

himself, of the human and the divine, by exhibiting a heavenly mind within the conditions of our mortal life? This is a question for the spiritual nature alone, and God forbid that we should disturb in any man's soul the blessed conviction that the Christ is divine,—that Jesus is indeed the "Word made Flesh,"—and deprive him of this spiritual and obligatory faith by any dogmatical or philosophical views of our own respecting the manner of God's connections with his mind. We ought to be cautious how we pluck from any soul the saving belief that the character of Jesus is divine, the stamp of God upon humanity,—and surely our sympathy with the man who possesses that belief ought to be stronger than any feeling of difference that can possibly exist between us, arising out of a question purely critical, historical, and philosophical. We are agreed as to the spiritual results: we differ as to the means which God has employed. If Mr. Wood accepts every Christian idea in its *practical* relations to the soul of man,—who is cruel or bold enough to attempt to persuade him that he has no reason for considering Christ to be divine? Rather let us rejoice that he sees in Jesus the harmony of the heavenly and the human; however he may refuse our explanation of the manner in which Providence effected the union. There may be an inconsistency in Mr. Wood's mind,—his philosophy may not be in harmony with his Christian Faith,—but he professes this faith, he manifests his deep feeling of it by the energy and quickening power with which he breathes it into words,—and is his faith, his spiritual allegiance to Christ, to pass for nothing, because he questions something, not connected with the divine soul of Jesus,—but merely with the manifestations of his external life? We differ with Mr. Wood, but our difference is not one that affects the essence of Christianity. We do not understand how he can accept Jesus as the Son of God and the Son of Man along with his other views of his history,—but it is for him, not for us, to make peace between his spiritual nature and his philosophy. Mr. Wood, however, does not deny the special, and therefore in effect the *supernatural formation* of Christ's mind,—but only the miracles usually believed to be wrought by Jesus for the purposes of self-manifestation and of evidence. Neither of the replies to his Lecture has given him the advantage of this distinction. Mr. Wood does not deny the great miracle of Christ himself. "What is the miracle on which we all take our stand? The miracle which is inseparable from our faith, as its deepest and most interior ground, and without which every thing natural within the sphere of the spirit, however admirable it may be, would lose its true value in our sight? It is the miracle of Christ himself. It is the miracle that the Word was made flesh,—the

miracle that the glory of the only begotten son was displayed in a human form, while all others without exception had sinned, and come short of the glory of God. It is the miracle that Christ not only possessed the glory of the only begotten son, but from the beginning has given, and still gives, to all who believe on him, the power to become the children of God. To this miracle we cannot cleave too fast; into this we cannot go too deep. Every new glimpse which we obtain of it must increase our wisdom and power; the more we look into it, the greater will be our power to become Children of God; for just in that proportion do we gain in the faith that is the fountain of blessedness. But what shall we say concerning those miraculous deeds of Christ, of which so many are described at length in the history of his life, and, still more, mentioned in general, without a detailed account? *These* miracles are connected in Christ with that great miracle; but, manifested in history among the phenomena of human life, they were early separated from that, and have never been completely united. Ten lepers were healed by the Redeemer; only one returned to give glory to God; the others,—they remained cleansed; they were free from their bodily disease, but they obtained no share in the spiritual miracle. Many paralytics were cured; many blind made to see; many deaf again heard; but only those who listened to another word than that, 'Thy faith hath saved thee,'—only those who because they desired it from the heart, heard also another word, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee,' obtained a part in the great spiritual miracle of God."*

As we think this controversy, in the present state of opinion, of great importance, and do not find our own views fully represented by any of those who have taken part in it, we shall briefly examine these Lectures and Sermons—and then more distinctly state what we conceive to be the *present* relations of Miracles to the Evidences of Christianity.

We shall place in the foreground Mr. Wood's confession of faith. He is "constrained to believe that Jesus Christ was the *chosen* servant of Almighty God,"—and he thinks, "that whenever in ages after Jesus Christ, a firm faith in God, in his being, his spirituality, and his providence, and a fervid hope of a future life have been cherished, they may be traced to the influence of his ministry." From this faith Mr. Wood separates every thing of a miraculous nature, except what may have taken place within the soul of Christ. Even this, he thinks, cannot be distinguished from any ordinary communication of God to the soul

* Schleiermacher, as quoted by Ripley.

of Man. This is the first *argument* that occurs in Mr. Wood's pages. He says, "it is not *conceivable* that any communication should take place between the divine mind and the human mind, except such as must be resolved into the bestowment on that human mind by the divine mind, of peculiar power, unusual wisdom, foresight, knowledge and virtue." We understand the purport of this to be, that Christ could have no certainty of God's immediate communication with him,—and only collected his Mission from his qualifications. He *felt* his capacities, and *inferred* his office. This is utterly gratuitous and arbitrary. What is there to prevent the conceivableness that it is within the limits of God's power to make a distinct and definite communication to the soul of man? The element of Christ's spirit was the consciousness that he had a mission from God,—a consciousness not derived from inference, but the result of inspiration, the voice of God in him which he never ceased to hear. This was the secret of his Power, his Love, his Elevation. He felt himself sent to be the Saviour of the world. How can an *a priori* argument make us doubt God's power to convey the certainty of such a divine mission to the spirit of Christ? For ourselves we could not "conceive" the possibility of Christ's Life and Character, without such a communication. The miracles of manifestation we could part with more easily than with his certain indubitable sense of intimate union with the spirit of God. And with Mr. Hincks, "we can have no doubt that, if required for his purposes, God can command the means of access to the mind which he has himself formed."

Mr. Wood presents a list of the most startling miracles connected with Christianity,—and, without reason given, announces his rejection of them all. Mr. Hincks exercises his reason and critical judgment upon this list, and accepts some, and rejects others,—thus adopting what Dr. Hutton calls "the gross absurdity of the supposition that we can both use the Gospel-records as history, and treat them as fiction." Of course we cannot use the *same* portions in both these ways; but in the use both of the higher and of the lower Criticism, we may legitimately exercise this discrimination on the Gospel history, and every other history. The only question between Mr. Hincks and Mr. Wood is to what *extent* should this be done. Mr. Wood does not state his principle of rejection; we only know it to be universal. Mr. Hincks is guided in his selections by critical considerations, and internal evidences of genuineness, fidelity, and consistency. Both Mr. Hincks and Dr. Hutton press hardly upon Mr. Wood with the difficulty, that if the miraculous portions of the history are fictitious, then no reliance

can be placed upon any part of it. Yet Mr. Hincks admits some degree of fiction,—and it is not necessary to charge intentional falsehood on the historians, unless it can be proved that these passages were written by the immediate attendants on Jesus, and that there was no time for awe-struck tradition and sincere enthusiasm to give to the narratives their present form. Mr. Hincks and Dr. Hutton have both strangely fallen into the error and the injustice of attributing to Mr. Wood the view that the miracles are not only fictitious, but also the fabrications of the *first* disciples. Mr. Wood would answer, we suppose, "that it is impossible to establish the existence of the Gospels within the first century of Christianity, or to prove their authorship. The magnitude of the effects produced by Christianity, in the absence of fixed records, and authentic accounts, may in the course of time readily have confused the simplicity of causes, without intentional fraud. The thousand and one dissertations on the origin of the Gospels are sufficient to show that the Books are not individuals,—and that their evidence is not that of single, credible, responsible witnesses, whom we can identify in the persons of the Apostles. Oneness of date, and singleness of authorship, it is not possible satisfactorily to assign to these narratives." We mention this from no belief that it substantially affects the Gospel accounts, but in common justice, to protect Mr. Wood from the monstrous supposition which Dr. Hutton arbitrarily attributes to him, that the immediate Apostles of Jesus Christ were "Mendacious," and "that he could not teach his own followers common honesty." This is the common *error*, from no quarter however to be less expected than from the perfectly truthful and gentle mind of Dr. Hutton, of imputing to an opponent our own inferences from his views.

We must acknowledge in Mr. Wood's Lecture, for the most part, an admirable spirit, no little ability and eloquence, and the vivid evidence of a deep-felt sympathy with the spiritual Christ,—but as an exposition of the complicated, delicate, and difficult question of "Miracles," it is at all points unworthy alike of the Subject and of the Place from which it was uttered,—slight, declaratory, self-willed, and not only not grappling with, but not even mentioning the main considerations on which Judgment hangs. So profound a subject demanded a fuller, a more respectful treatment from an oral Teacher. No man led by this Lecture alone, to reject Miracles from Christianity, could give a *reason* against the faith that is not in him. We suppose Mr. Wood has already sufficiently repented of his inconsiderate, wanton, and altogether discreditable mention of Lardner. Giving him credit for such penitence, we spare him the reiteration of

Mr. Hincks' honest indignation, or of Dr. Hutton's good humoured and restrained, yet scourging satire.

We could have wished that this controversy had taken another form;—that it had been, not upon the reality of Miracles, but upon their present relations to Christianity. What is the exact meaning of the assertion that "miracles are the proper and *only* sufficient proof of Revelation?"* Does it mean that the miracles must be proved *first*, and that, then, they establish every thing, said or done in connection with them, to be divine? If this is not the meaning, the whole assertion amounts to nothing,—yet this is evidently not reconcileable either with logic or with facts. There is no necessary connection between a miracle performed, and the *truth* of a doctrine uttered. The Apostles wrought miracles at the very time when they entertained sensual, unspiritual notions of the Messiah's Kingdom,—and uttered them too. Peter had miraculous power at the moment he was guilty of desertion and falsehood. The Gospels would lead us to suppose that Judas Iscariot could have healed the sick by supernatural energy, at the hour in which he was betraying Christ. Nay, what are we to say to the Miracles which the Christian records themselves attribute to the *enemies* of Christianity,—to the miracles which Christ himself attributes to his Jewish persecutors,—"if I cast out devils through the prince of the devils, by whom then do your children cast them out?" Miracles then, in themselves considered, are so far from being the only, that they are not any proof of a Revelation. We find them in the same Books that convey to us the works of Christ, "the works of his Father," in connection with views and deeds which God would disown.

Neither would it be possible to prove the miracles of Christianity on external historical testimony alone. It is the spiritual, the heavenly, the true divine in Christ, that requires, and proves the supernatural. It is certainly true that it is largely from a miraculous manifestation that this divine Image is reflected to us, but it is the picture that reconciles us to the magnitude of the frame, not the magnitude of the frame that proves the value of the picture,—it is the reality, the consistency, the perfection of the divine excellence that forbids us to question or disturb the external forms in which God exhibited it, and from which we have collected it. But this is a totally different thing from the assertion that miracles are the *only* proofs of a revelation,—for in fact the miracles are rather proved by, accepted *with*, than proofs *of*, the moral and spiritual Christ, *who*

* Hincks' Sermon. p. 8.

*is the revelation.* Let us put this to the test. Could any evidence establish the miracles of Christ, apart from his divine perfections? Are not these essential to the *proof*, to the credibility, of miracles? Is it not the heavenly soul that inclines us to the superhuman origin? Do we not *begin* with the spiritual sympathy and appreciation, and *end* in unquestioning faith, as to the external manifestations of the divine? Is it not from the centre of Christ's own soul that we become first truly conscious of his connections with God? Or even supposing that the apprehension of the morally divine, and the supernatural frame in which it is exhibited, present themselves simultaneously, is it yet just or accurate to say, that the miraculous is the *only* proper evidence of a revelation? Miracle may be the *condition* of the Revelation we have, but it is not its evidence; and it is entirely arbitrary to suppose that God might not have made it evident that Jesus Christ was the Image of Deity, the authoritative Model of Duty, the Revelation of the heavenly peace and life which Immortals own, without any employment of miracles for purposes of proof. The morally and spiritually divine, wherever it appears, must be self-evidencing, and though it may appear under the conditions of the miraculous, it is not proved by them, *but gives to them their credibility.* Miracles are but the forms in which the spirit manifests itself; and to us who were not witnesses, nor have the means of examining the witnesses, it is the spirit that authenticates the forms.

Two points seem to us overlooked in Mr. Hincks' able and vigorous defence of the necessary connection of Miracles with a Revelation; first, that as evidence, a miracle witnessed, and a miracle reported in ancient documents, are of a totally different character; and secondly, that the *superhuman certainty* which the Miracle is supposed to attach to the Revelation, resolves itself ultimately into the very *human* degree of certainty which we can attach to the genuineness, authenticity, *individual* character, and faithful preservation of the reporting books. It is not the certainty of the miracle, but the certainty of *the literary evidence* which attests the miracle on which we have to rely. Of such certainty as this none but the learned can partake,—nor indeed is it a subject that admits of certainty at all. What means have we of judging of the personal *characters*, of the credibility, of Matthew, or Luke, or Mark, independently of the very books in question? We have to resort to the reports for all that we know of the character of the reporters. It is not surely their reporting Miracles that induces us to trust them,—this is rather a difficulty in their way; it must be some-

thing of *internal* or *self evidence* that induces us to give credence to reporters of miracles, of whom we know nothing but what they themselves tell us. Whatever it be of moral and internal evidence that constrains us to give credence to books reporting miracles, *that* should be considered as the true and proper evidence of the Revelation. It is evident that external testimony will not avail us here. Suppose the books identified with their authors,—suppose their literary preservation perfect, what do we know of Matthew, Luke, or Mark, that we should believe their miraculous narratives? We know *nothing* but what these very narratives tell us. What induces us then to believe these narratives and these miracles? It must be something possessing a moral self-evidence, awakening the highest feelings of certainty of which the human soul is capable. To us, miracles, instead of proving, are proved by, this spiritual, moral, internal light. These two propositions then we hold to be undeniable, and though overlooked, not a little important in relation to the present controversy:

First;—that the mind which makes the truth of Revelation depend upon the truth of Miracles reported in ancient documents, can have no *certainty* beyond that which it reposes in its own literary judgment,—a degree of certainty which for the learned cannot amount to more than a moderate probability,—and for the unlearned has no existence whatever. The strength of a chain is the strength of its *weakest* link. The weakest link in the documentary proof must measure the confidence which such minds can repose in the truth of Christianity; and the great mass of men, if "*miracles are the only sufficient proof of a revelation*," have nothing to decide their faith,—for the learned men do not agree. Strauss is as learned, as able, as honest, as Lardner. Has the unlearned man no means of judging between them? We think he has,—but not if miracles must be proved first, independently of the support which they themselves derive from the moral character, the self-evidence, of the Revelation.

Secondly;—that since we are not in the position of the original eye-witnesses, nor have the means of individualizing and cross-examining, Miracles reported derive their credibility from the circumstances in the midst of which they appear, and are authenticated by, instead of authenticating the Revelation. The moral and spiritual Christianity has now to support its miraculous framework; and it is the highest attestation to the "light of the glory of God, shining in the face of Christ," that it compels us to accept it, as we find it, in connection with Miracles. Miracles reported can prove nothing,—for they are themselves

incapable of being proved by *external* testimony, independently of the spiritual realities they convey; only a *feeling* of the superhuman beauty and truth makes credible the superhuman mode of exhibiting it. In the order of time then, to us now, belief in the truth precedes belief in the Miracle,—or if they are simultaneous, it is the *self-evidence* that communicates both together.

"There is no conceivable evidence," says Mr. Hincks, "of supernatural communication to the mind, which ought to satisfy any one, excepting an external sign, indisputably connected with the individual making the pretension, offered to the senses of others as well as himself, under circumstances favourable for examination, and of such a kind as not to admit of rational explanation without the supposition of immediate divine interference." Now this is an evidence *we* do not possess; we have only the evidence of *books*,—and it seems clear, that it must be something divine, by self-manifestation, in the Revelation itself, which makes us accept such evidence. The incurred sufferings, and altered circumstances of the witnesses, are evidence of their sincerity, but not of their infallibility; and besides, we must previously judge for ourselves, on *moral* grounds, how far the facts, if true, are sufficient to produce and justify the alleged changes and exposures to suffering, before we accept them in evidence;—so that, under any view, it is the *character* of the Revelation that gives to the alleged facts their weight and value.

Mr. Hincks says, "that the goodness and wisdom of what is taught is no proof of a divine communication, because we cannot precisely tell what in any given circumstances unaided reason may do; we cannot therefore draw a line between what is human and divine; besides, if we were in a condition particularly to need reformation, we should be incapable of estimating the *goodness*, though we could very well feel the *authority* of what was delivered to us." *Did* those who were incapable of estimating Christ's goodness feel his authority? Were not the Belief and Philosophy of the age in which he appeared, such as absolutely to prevent any surrender to his authority, from those who did not *feel* his goodness? Was it not to the "works of his Father," works manifesting the Goodness of God, that he appealed to prove "whence he came?" Besides, can we not draw the line between the human and the divine as certainly in moral as in physical facts? That in a certain condition of civilization which had no natural affinities with such a being, "the Image of God in Man" should appear,—is not that fact as certainly distinguishable from what is ordinary in the experience of men, as

any alleged Miracle? Surely the laws of the moral world are as fixed as those of the material,—and Moral Power is more capable of impressing us with a sense of the Divine, than Physical Power. We hold the view, that we cannot morally distinguish between the human and the divine, to be subversive of all faith, not only in Christianity but in Religion itself. It is a distinction which every good man daily makes in the depths of his own soul, when he feels God to be present with him. The divine Word within us all is not our own. And if that Word should become Flesh, should we not have the power of recognizing the divine *realization,* God manifest in Man? The moral Christ is the great Miracle, and the universal Miracle,—the only one in respect to which we are placed in the same circumstances as the original witnesses.

We think that Mr. Hincks has been betrayed by his fervid sense of the importance of the question at issue into one or two statements not entirely just to his own mind,—for we believe that a more pure and faithful lover of Truth, a more courageous Champion of the Rights of Opinion, one who would more readily do battle for Jew or Gentile, nowhere exists. We shall only think it necessary therefore to enter our protest against the following averments:—First; "That it is concluded amongst us, that whenever a minister, supported or not by others, adopts opinions at variance *with the views upon which the society was founded,** he will in consequence withdraw." This is an opinion that would speedily decide the Hewley case. This is the view of the Independents, and of "certain Lawyers." This would effectually stop all progress, or else oblige every Minister and Congregation advancing in the knowledge of the truth, to migrate yearly to a new chapel. The only principle on which any society should be founded is the principle of Free Inquiry, with which no after result of opinion can be at variance. Mr. Hincks, we are satisfied, only means that a Minister should not hold his place in opposition to the views and wishes of his congregation. He is not the man to mean that a Minister should not lead them with him to what he thinks Truth, if they are willing to go. "The views upon which the society was founded," may make it legally necessary to part with a building, or an endowment,—but that is no reason for parting with a Congregation, unless they wish it, or with the principle of Progress. To Mr. Wood, however, Mr. Hincks' observation, in no sense of it, applies. His Society was founded on the principle of Free Inquiry; yet he retires, contrary to the wishes of *a majority.*

Secondly;—"That the doctrine expressed in Mr. Wood's

* The italics are our own.

Lecture differs at least as widely from the characteristic opinions of our body of Christians (Unitarians) as any of those which we think ourselves most called upon to oppose." We can have no sympathy with this sentiment,—nor can we compare things so totally dissimilar as Orthodoxy, and any form, however erroneous, of rational Christianity. The one is a product, though perhaps a mistaken one, of a principle we admit,—the other is founded in principles which we hold to be fundamentally and absolutely false and injurious. We are satisfied Mr. Hincks would admit that the pure Deism of a religious mind was not so far from rational Christianity as Orthodoxy is. Orthodoxy is not *in the direction* of free inquiry; and any honest and pious fruit of that spirit is better, more healthy, more nourishing, more like Christianity, than an implicit and damnatory faith. We may be wrong about the Miraculous, for it is a question of Criticism and History and Philosophy,—but as to the essential part of Orthodoxy, all the Laws of our Nature must be changed before we could connect it with the Father of our souls,—it contradicts the primary Revelation, and *cannot* be true.

Thirdly;—"That if he held Mr. Wood's opinions he would not retain the Christian name for one hour." Mr. Hincks falls here into the common error of transferring the feelings that belong to one set of views to a totally different set of views. He supposes himself to be placed in Mr. Wood's point of view, and insists that he would retain all the feelings that belong to his own point of view. If his views of Christianity were what Mr. Wood's are, he would do as Mr. Wood has done. If Mr. Wood assented to Mr. Hincks' view of the essentials of Christianity, he would, no doubt, make no pretension to the name. It is not for *us* to undertake the task of proving to those who believe Christ's Mission to be divine, that they have no grounds for such belief. That belief is a blessed influence. It enshrines the Image of God in the Conscience, and makes human life the conditions given by Providence under which we are to manifest "the Life of God in the Soul of Man," the heavenly spirit under the forms of earthly discipline. Shall we disturb that "divine Belief," that "authoritative Religion," in any mind, for the sake of some possible error in the logical processes, the avenues of evidence? Rather let us spend our energies, and exercise our souls, in understanding and revealing the divine Christ,—and that stupendous Moral Miracle will carry the mind up to the immediate Fountain of heavenly Beauty, of Grace and Truth,—*or nothing will.*

We must say in conclusion that we entirely dissent from Mr. Hincks' limitation of the internal evidence of Christianity to the

*literary* and *critical* proofs of truth and fidelity afforded by the narratives themselves. It is the power which resides in those narratives to call up divine conceptions in our own souls that is the true internal evidence of Christianity. It claims to be from God, and it proves the claim by drawing the mind of man into more immediate communication with the mind of God. It is a divine Instrument for placing the soul in harmony with God, through spiritual sympathies with him who is the Mediator, the Son of God and the Son of Man. In that "power of God unto Salvation" resides the divinest Authentication, the self-evidence of the Gospel of Christ. "I am not ashamed," says the great Apostle, "of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto Salvation, for therein the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith." Now Miracles are not matters of Faith but of Testimony. They become matters of Faith only when accepted for the sake of, and as consonant with, the moral and spiritual Revelation.

Notwithstanding the general ability, and despite the painful crudity of the introduction, the frequent beauty and truth of *feeling* displayed in Mr. Harwood's Lecture, we are constrained to say that, like Mr. Wood's, it contributes nothing to the argument,—and whatever it may do "to open," it has done nothing "to close" this great question. There are certain crying evils in the religious world, of dogmatism, bigotry, materialism, finality, which Mr. Harwood thinks would be abated by the absence of a Miraculous and authoritative Revelation,—and the conclusion arrived at is, that there is no Miraculous and authoritative Revelation. Now this is very unsatisfactory Logic. Mr. Harwood might prove Atheism by the same process of reasoning. *It* would effectually abate all bigotry, cant, fanaticism, persecution. This is to get rid of religious evils, by getting rid of Religion. The question of Miracles is a question of *facts*; not a question to be determined by asking what good do we get from them, or with what evils do they happen to be allied.

The one argument which Mr. Harwood brings against the Gospel Miracles is this, "that they attest the Hebrew Messiahship of Jesus,—are the witnesses of Providence that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ of Isaiah and Ezekiel: that is to say—and here is the difficulty—the Gospel miracles *attest that as true which turned out not to be true, which we now know was not true.*" This is an arbitrary assertion, and we recognize only the signs of arbitrariness in the *argumentum ad verecundiam*, "that it is one of the plainest and most easily proved negations in all history and literature, to any man who will fairly and freely look at it as a matter of historical fact and literary interpreta-

tion." Even the least dogmatical divines have a sad habit of appropriating to themselves all inquiries pursued "fairly and freely,"—and of judging of the "fairness and freedom" by the final agreement or non-agreement with themselves. We do not deny the traces in the three first Gospels of the Messianic conceptions. But is Mr. Harwood a believer in plenary inspiration, that he should regard them as exhibiting Christ's mind through what Lord Bacon calls "dry and pure light,"—and attribute nothing of the Jewish colouring to the Medium? There are the distinctest announcements in the three first Gospels by Christ himself that he was both the Messiah of the Jews, *and* the Saviour of the World. As well might Mr. Harwood deny that Christ foretold his own resurrection because the Evangelists did not understand him, and related their impressions *historically*,—not correcting them by the after events, nor reflecting upon them the light of a later knowledge. The Evangelists narrate each step just as it happened,—and they were Jews in their views of the Messiah, until after the day of Pentecost. The narrative of the Gospels does not *include* the time when the disciples ceased to believe in a Hebrew Messiah, —and like true narrators, they never confuse our perception of the historical development of their ideas, by exhibiting events in cross lights. They follow the order of time, and tell us what they were, and what they thought, and what they passed through, at each successive moment. And if this does not apply to the Gospel of St. John, it is because his Gospel was written rather for a doctrinal than an historical purpose. We must here enter our protest against a very common practice, viz., to deny the inspiration of the Gospels, and at the same time to build up hypotheses on verbal grounds, to try and test Christianity by a principle to which, except on the supposition of plenary inspiration, it is not amenable.

We agree with Mr. Harwood, that the question put to God by Christ on the day of the crucifixion, was not the question of immortality, but the question of Messiahship; and we believe, in which we differ from Mr. Harwood, that on the third day God glorified his Son, and showed him to be "*both Lord and Christ.*" Wherein is it inconsistent with reason, or analogy, or "the spirit of the prophets which is the testimony of Jesus," that out of the Jewish Messiah, the fullness and completion of the preparatory dispensation, God should develop his universal gift, the predestinated Saviour of the World?

We shall now, apart from this controversy, briefly state our views of the relation of miracles to Christianity, and of the *sentiment* with which we should regard those whose soul accepts the

Christ as divine and sent by God, but whose peculiar mental constitution is not impressed by the miraculous,—and who believe because of the spiritual or self-evidence. We have necessarily anticipated, and in our observations upon the views of others partially given our own ; but it is a subject which, better than most others, will bear something of repetition. There is perhaps no theological point on which more confusion of thought prevails, than the present position of Miracles in relation to Christianity, and their logical value as evidence.

The reason once given by Christ for *not* working miracles, has a very decided bearing upon this controversy. "He did not many mighty works there *because of their unbelief.*" On the common view, miracles are regarded as instruments for the production of faith, external proofs directed against unbelief—and on this view one would expect them to abound wherever belief required to be excited—that the rule would be, 'the less faith, the more miracle.' Certainly, if miracles are the proper foundations of faith, it is a very extraordinary and infelicitous conjunction, "he did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief." On the common view, the connection here indicated between a want of faith, and the withholding of miracles, the supposed producers of faith, has no suitableness. The absence of the faith ought to have been the most imperative reason for the presence of the miracle. But so thought not Jesus: and this may naturally excite a doubt whether we do not assign to miracles a wrong position in the temple of revelation. We make them lie at the foundation. We talk of them as fundamentals; as the only conceivable proofs of a truth announced, or a messenger sent by God. We make them essential to the very idea of a Christian. We say that a man cannot be a Christian except by a belief in miracles. Yet Christ reversed all this. He not only held faith to be independent of miracles, but he required faith as a previous condition before he would work a miracle. With him, instead of faith being occasioned by miracles—miracles were occasioned by faith. Nor is the text already cited by any means a solitary passage. It contains the spirit of his views on this subject. "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign." "Ye will not believe except ye see signs and wonders." "Blessed are they who have not seen, and yet have believed." "Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep. My sheep hear my voice, and follow me." It is evident that the faith which could only be excited by miracles Jesus regarded as coarse, material, unspiritual; and that faith, to be genuine and operative, must have its origin in moral sympathy and appreciation of his truth. They in whose hearts his words raised echoes, who seized and understood his character by a

kindred sentiment—they alone believed in *spirit* and in *truth*, and the foundation of their belief was not miracle, but moral affinities. They felt, they sympathized, they appreciated—and therefore believed. "No man can come unto me," says Jesus, "except my Father who hath sent me *draw* him." What can this mean, except that to come unto him men must feel some attraction towards him—that this attraction must consist in moral similarity, the only attraction that brings hearts and characters together—and that where there was a spirit totally opposite to his own, no mere miracle could attract it towards him—it must be morally and sympathetically repelled? Belief and Unbelief are nothing else than Attraction and Repulsion. Sensibility to moral beauty is the true spring of faith: those on whose sentiments the goodness of Jesus impressed itself, whose sympathies took fire and glowed, would of course be attracted, love, believe, and follow—and all others would feel no bond with him, and a miracle could not change their hearts and give them moral affinities that belonged not to their characters. Certain it is that admiration and appreciation for a character always requires some similarity to it in ourselves: we must sympathize with it before we love it. Affinity is the origin of faith; the spiritual ligament which connects our souls with purer beings and brighter worlds, with Jesus, with Heaven, with God. Destroy that moral sympathy, and you make the heart inaccessible to religion, to that world of ideal perfection, to which Conscience betakes itself to gaze on excellence, and become penetrated with the ideas of goodness and God.

That miracles are not the proper foundations of faith, we think the unbelief of the Jews proves conclusively. Their case is a signal instance of the truth, that a mental bias is utterly inaccessible to a merely *external* instrument—that with a cluster of wrong ideas in the mind, no miracle could withdraw it from its previous modes of thinking, and import into it a correct faith. They might not be able to deny the miracle—but what of that? Would a miracle, if performed before *our* eyes, alter all our previous impressions—would it destroy all our habitual associations—would it revolutionize our moral sympathies, and turn us out of all our past modes of feeling, hoping, thinking? We must know very little of our own minds if we are inclined to ascribe to a miracle any such power. It would leave the moral affinities of our characters precisely as it found them. Our spiritual tastes, our favourite expectations, our peculiar biasses—the direction of our desires, the kind of ideas which our nature and habits had familiarized us with, would all remain unchanged. A miracle would not touch these. A miracle is the setting aside

of a physical Law: there is surely no reason why the eye-witness of a miracle should instantly become changed in character and heart. He would certainly believe in the power of him who wrought the miracle to produce such an effect,—but would that give him any new moral sympathies with his character, would it attach him to it by spiritual affinities—would it make him love and appreciate qualities of life and heart towards which he had felt no attraction before—would it in a word give him that harmony of spirit without which there can be no religious faith? A belief in supernatural power is a very different thing from *faith*, in a religious sense, which always implies *a spiritual connection*, a sympathetic drawing of the mind—but it is only belief of the former kind, an acknowledgment of physical power, which would be produced even in an eye-witness of a miracle. The Jews were witnesses of Christ's miracles—but the leaning of their moral nature towards him, the bias of their tempers, expectations, spiritual affections, was nothing more after the miracle than before it. They still looked for a Messiah in the direction of their past habits—their old associations remained—the miracle was wrought upon external nature, not upon their minds—it did not do them such violence as to enter within them, destroy their characters, and alter the whole cast and colour of their sympathies. Such a miracle indeed might create faith—but only by annihilating our identity and our will. When then we transport ourselves to a time in which the belief of supernatural agency was not uncommon, and amid a people the direction of whose sympathies in their expectation of a Messiah was most alien from Jesus, we have little difficulty in explaining from the principles of human nature how it was that miracles wrought no effect upon their faith—that, to use his own phrase, they "could not come to him" because there was nothing kindred within to draw them towards him. The explanation is sound: but whoever receives it is thereby admitting that miracles are not the proper foundations of faith.

We know it may be said, by that kind of subtlety which perplexes but always misses the true point of a question, that miracles *are* the proper foundations of faith, and would have produced their effect as such even with the Jews, had it not been for an accidental superstition of their's, which familiarized them with the miraculous, and rendered them impervious to the argument derived from supernatural works. Now we answer, that the existence of this superstition is the very thing which shows that miracles cannot be the true foundations of faith: for how can that be a right foundation on which, though it is admitted, nothing need be built—and which a low credulity can vulgarize

and deprive of its power? The Jews rejected Jesus, though they believed his miracles: could they have rejected him if they had morally sympathized with him? and what more is wanting to prove that moral affinities, and not miracles, are the proper foundations of faith? If miracles were the only, or the convincing, evidences of a revelation, then neither the Jew nor the Heathen could have had any preponderating reason for embracing Christianity—for certain it is, that they regarded this miraculous power as in no way peculiar to either Jesus or his apostles. This belief in the supernatural was universal at the time, and if this it was which accepted Christianity, and to which Christianity appealed as to a Judge—then it appealed to the lowest credulity, and was accepted only in common with the meanest superstitions. They who already believe in miracles of their own, will not of course accept a new religion merely because it too has miracles. Since this is a common quality, there must be something else to determine their preference—and as Jew and Gentile both professed to have miracles of their own, Christianity, nothing distinguished in this respect, must have appealed to some other principle, and established itself on some other foundations of faith. It did appeal to other principles—to spiritual perception—to the attraction by which it drew human nature towards one who was its full and faultless representative, who provided for all its wants, and harmonized all its faculties, combining its various elements in the symmetry of a perfect mind. Whoever felt himself drawn towards that mind by the power of sympathy, had a foundation, and the only foundation, for *faith*. "No man can come unto me, except my Father who hath sent me draw him." *

* "Many Christians," says Schleiermacher, (quoted by Ripley,) "remain in the error of ascribing too great importance to what is merely external in the life and manifestation of Christ; whereas its importance properly consists in the fact, that the fullness of the Godhead dwelt in him; that he came down from heaven in the sense which he early expressed, that he had no will but that of his Father; and as he afterwards said, that he had come to show the Father, and to make it possible for men to be taught of God. But so long as we seek the ground of faith in him in anything external, in the mode in which his earthly being began, in the miracles which accompanied his activity among men, or in outward things by which he was distinguished from other men,—we are not in the true way of believing, and are yet subject to many doubts, which we ought long since to have got over. For a true and living faith will say to itself, These things indeed are so, as related in the Holy Scriptures; but it might have been otherwise; and this fact can establish no essential difference between Christ and other men. The redemption which he brings depends alone on the fact, that the fullness of the Godhead dwelt in him; that he came down from above to reveal to us the divine will, and to receive us into communion with his Heavenly Father; that with the fullness of the Godhead in him was manifested the true and living image of the Eternal Being; and that he has shown us by what he was, and what was in him, the brightness of the divine glory. To look alone on this inward character, to cling to this union of the divine and human in him, to regard him as the true and exhaustless source of all the divine communications through grace to men,—this is the genuine, living faith."

What, then, is the true position and use of miracles in the scheme of revelation? They are not of any force as arguments for moral truths. There is no logic in this—Christ wrought a miracle, and therefore God is good—or, Christ wrought a miracle, and therefore his character is the perfection of human nature, and the model for our imitation—or, Christ wrought a miracle, and therefore the human soul is immortal—or, Christ wrought a miracle, and therefore man's true happiness consists in the subjugation of the animal, and the development of the spiritual, nature. All these propositions are true, but not one of them is proved by miracle, or capable of being so proved. They rest upon quite other evidence—and nothing would be more absurd than to adduce a miracle in proof of the goodness of God—or the happiness of virtue—or the meekness and majesty of Christ's example. Yet these are the very soul of Christianity—and therefore Christianity, as a system of moral truths, does not make its appeal to miracles, but to the moral nature of man. No moral truth can be proved by a miracle, for a miracle is only a physical fact—and a moral truth belongs to another class of subjects, whose evidence is to be found nowhere but in the human soul. If the main features of Christianity had not been made by divines and theologians to rest upon miracles—if they had been offered to faith on the ground of their inherent excellence, their own ample attractions for our spiritual nature, how readily, how universally, would they have been embraced by all who felt that they had echoes within the soul, and that Jesus was indeed the very ideal of humanity. Who would not be a Christian, if to be a Christian required faith only in such truths as these—that the holy Jesus was the human image of the mind of God, and that the universal Father is more perfect and more tender than his holy and gentle child, by as much as Deity transcends humanity—that the character of the Christ is God's aim and purpose for us all, the result at which He desires every individual to arrive through the discipline and sufferings of earth—and that immortality was impressed upon that mind—that its profound sympathy with the spirit of God, the surrender of its own immediate interests for the sake of the purposes and drift of Providence—the identification of self with the divine will—the constant manifestations of a style of thought and action drawn on a wider scale than that of the present life, and that placed him in harmony with better worlds—that these marked him out as a being whose nature was adjusted to more glorious scenes—whose soul was out of due proportion to its merely earthly and external lot, and whose appropriate home must be the pure heaven of God? Would

any one refuse admission to these moral truths as they are given off to our souls from the pure life of Jesus, if he was permitted to receive them on their own evidence, and not required to arrive at them through a faith in miracles? The truths speak for themselves: they address themselves to our moral nature, and it is utterly inconceivable that a miracle can confer upon them any additional credibility. This is worthy of being seriously reflected upon. Can a miracle prove a moral truth? Is the human soul immortal because Christ worked a miracle? Is the example of Jesus seized upon by our deepest sympathies, and felt to be the ideal of humanity, because Christ worked a miracle? Do not these truths find an entrance to our hearts through an entirely different channel, the channel of our spiritual affinities? The common answer will be, that if Jesus who worked miracles asserted the immortality of the soul, it must be true. The flaw of the theory lies in this; that the miracles themselves require for their own proof, the authentication which the divine system, in connection with which they are found, gives to them. They cannot be established as independent facts, apart from that spiritual perfection which justifies and seems to require them. Besides, the proofs of the authenticity of historical records, on which these alleged facts must be believed, depend upon an enormous mass of acquired knowledge, and cannot possibly be the *universal* evidence of Christianity. The miracles of Christianity are so far from being independent external evidences of its truths, that the very reverse is the fact,— it is the excellence of Christianity itself which gives credibility to its miracles. It is the religion which supports the miracles, and not the miracles the religion. We admit its supernatural origin because we feel that the religion itself is so divine, cut out so clear from the errors of man, that it must have been given off direct from God. But this is setting aside the miracles as evidences,—and making them find their own evidence in the spiritual glories of Christianity itself. Miracles are not proofs but things requiring to be proved—and whose best proof is the matchless beauty and truth of the system which countenances them. If Christianity as it appeals to our rational spiritual nature were less perfect than it is—no power could have attached credibility to its miracles,—they would have sunk it long since. It is the system, then, supports the miracles—not the miracles the system. We believe in its wonderful origin only because itself is so worthy of God. We do not say here are miracles —therefore we will accept the moral truths of the system— but we say here are grand truths. and they are so grand that

we incline to assign to them a miraculous origin: the truths thus stand out, independent of the miracles, and whatever be their origin, since they thus recommend themselves to our nature, they ought to be no less dear to our hearts, no less binding upon conscience. This is one eminent advantage of this posture of miracles—it leaves Christianity to be judged of—not as a supernatural fact of history, with its evidences in the obscure past,—but as a moral truth of nature and the common human heart,—with its evidences in the truths themselves. If miracles are the only proper foundations of faith, is it not manifest that this is to make the certain depend upon the uncertain? Are we not to be devoted to the character of Jesus until we are *first* convinced of the integrity and accuracy of certain historians who relate certain miracles? Is our moral sympathy to take no hold on Christ until this historical inquiry is first gone through and settled to our satisfaction? And if this critical examination ended doubtfully, would the moral features of Christianity change their aspects—and should our affections and the aspirations of Conscience find nothing in its great author still to venerate and love? The moral and spiritual lineaments of Christianity still speak for themselves—they require no external evidence—we are as favourably placed for judging of them, as John, or Mary, or Paul—but the miracles do not speak for themselves—they do not carry with them their own evidence—they rest upon testimony, and testimony at the best is nothing more than probable; to make them, therefore, the indispensable foundations of faith, is to make the uncertain support the certain. No man can be so sure that certain miracles were actually performed as he is sure that the moral image of Jesus, which he draws from the Gospel, is a model for humanity and worthy of all imitation. And *if* he draws this image, and loves this model, and sets it up as the ideal of Conscience, and beholds in its human harmonies the shadowed symmetry of the perfect mind of God, is he to be denied the name of Christian, only because he doubts whether, in the course of time, something more of the marvellous than belonged to the original facts may not have crept into the documents?

We are far from regarding the Christian Miracles as doubtful. We are unable to account for Christianity without them. We see nothing in the circumstances of the age in which Jesus appeared capable of originating his character; nor can we explain the modifications which took place in the views of his disciples without the aid of these events; but if we held the miracles to be as doubtful as we now hold them to be true, whatever logicians may say, we should not be able to part with our

*faith* in Jesus,—his character would still appeal to our moral sentiments radiant with beauty, and impressed with immortality, —it would still win our love and bind our conscience,—to our spiritual nature he would still appear the very ideal of the soul, the perfect image of God, and the authoritative model for man. And is not this to have *faith* in Christianity? If it is not, we know not what is. Were we to define Christianity, we should say it is the moral image communicated to each mind by the character of Jesus, as delineated in the Gospels, and which moral image Conscience consents to take as its guide and model. Different minds will draw a different moral image from the historical sketch of Jesus contained in the Gospels; but he who takes that image, as his best idea of duty, and his best programme of Heaven, is a Christian. Nothing is wanting to constitute a Christian, except the internal acknowledgment that the character of Jesus affords us our best external aid to develop the ideas of duty and of faith. It is historically not doctrinally we receive him: but from the history each mind can be required only to take up those elements and moral features which enable it to form and body forth its ideal of perfection.

What was the purpose of the miracles of Jesus at the time they were performed?

The miracles of Christ fixed the gaze of the people upon his character, and for that purpose their agency was most important. They were ensigns and proclamations summoning every eye in the direction of Jesus. They did not prove the truths he uttered, but they marked him out as one who was to be observed, and they rivetted attention upon all that he did and said. They were like that voice of God,—"This is my beloved son, *hear ye* him:" but all the spiritual good was to result from that character, to which the miracle was only the means of directing attention. Indeed it is not easy to conceive how one like Jesus, so meek in majesty, could have arrested public observation, and held it upon himself, had it not been for these proclamations to attend. The character of the Saviour would certainly in that age have attracted little notice, had he possessed only the ordinary means of manifesting it. It might have been lost to us, because in that age of men so little analogous to the Christ, there was none to observe its quiet beauty,—to penetrate its deeper sentiments,—to perceive its profound but gentle unison with the spirit of Providence,—to note and preserve for after generations the story of its divine beneficence.

The miracles, too, are illustrations of the moral greatness of Jesus. The grandeur and meekness of his character was manifested through them. It has been said, with a profound truth

and beauty, that "the combination of the spirit of humanity, in its lowliest, tenderest form, with the consciousness of unrivalled and divine glories, is the most wonderful distinction of this wonderful character." It would be an awful and perilous gift to be entrusted with superhuman power. Who that knows his own nature would dare to accept of such a gift? What fantastic tricks, would not the wisest of us play before high Heaven? Yet how lowly, how self-denying, how temperate in the manifestations of this greatness, does Jesus appear? Even his beneficence is not excessive. You see more of the spirit of benevolence than of the outward act. There was no profusion of miracle affording outward relief. It has even been contended from this circumstance, that Jesus was acquainted with the principles which the modern science of political economy applies to the treatment of the poor. This is strained and injudicious; nevertheless it does manifest Jesus, with a singular wisdom and moderation, interfering as little as possible with the general course of God's Providence. He never violated in his miracles the spirit of his Father's natural administration of the Universe. Now this is a strong proof that the miracles are facts. If they had been fictions of the historians, would they have been conceived in such perfect keeping with all the rest of the character of Jesus? Would the natural and the supernatural have conspired to form such an harmonious image? How sublime appear the graceful features of Jesus, when we think of his extraordinary elevation above the outward necessities against which he bore himself so meekly. Those eyes which wept over Jerusalem, were illuminated with the unearthly light of prophecy! That hand, and those feet nailed to the cross, had dispelled disease, and walked upon the rushing wave! That voice which poured forth only affectionate remembrances and dying prayers, had rebuked the storm and called back the dead to life! Truly if we view Jesus apart from his great powers, we lose much of the moral sublimity of his mind. The wonderful contrasts of his character have a less ample delineation. The peculiar combination of circumstances amid which he had to work out his idea of perfection, was less difficult.

Why then, it will be asked, appear to be undermining the miracles, and at the same time asserting their importance? We answer, that to give them their due importance is not to undermine them, and that to give them an undue importance may be to undermine Christianity. Let them take their proper place as a part of that machinery which originated Christianity, and which secured its successful propagation. They belong to the philosophical question respecting the origin and causes of

Christianity. They have little connection with the far higher question of the essence and character of Christianity. *How* Christianity sprung up, not what Christianity *is*, is the question to which they apply. Even the miracle of the resurrection was far more a means of converting the Apostles, and spiritualizing their views of the Messiah, inspiring them to be faithful preachers of Jesus, than intended as a proof of the immortality of the human soul.

Let not the miracles now then, by a preposterous assumption that they are the very foundations of faith, prevent any mind, which may be constitutionally and hopelessly sceptical about them, from the delicious satisfaction of a moral trust in Jesus. The only great question is, has Christianity caught our spiritual sympathies? Has it given off to our souls an image of duty, which we take as our guide to God, and hold before us as our better conscience? Are its moral lineaments in possession of our entire veneration? Are its blended humanity and yet unquenchable aspirings, its minglings of sublimity and grace, our very ideal of a perfect human mind? Is Jesus, serene, affectionate, holy, unmoved by passions, rising without effort to encounter difficulties, entering always into the spirit of his Father, and having an inaccessible peace in the heaven of his mind, the grandest picture of our thought, our secret study, the most frequently contemplated, and the most deeply loved? Is our own power of conceiving such a character our strongest obligation to imitate it, and our most spiritual reason for believing that there must be a receptacle for spirits hereafter in a world where such goodness shall be realized? We refer now to those who are constitutionally and hopelessly sceptical of miracles. Let not that scepticism disturb their *faith* in moral and spiritual Christianity. If they believe in the *things* signified, let them not stumble at the sign. If their minds are so constituted that they find, after the most candid efforts and repeated trials, that miracles, whenever they intervene, present an insuperable obstacle to their rational and sympathetic apprehension of Jesus—then we would say, do not lose Christianity for their sakes—they are not, and they cannot be the essentials. Moral impressions, moral convictions, make the genuine faith. Love, venerate, imitate, sympathize with, follow the pure, meek, holy, benevolent, heaven-marked character of Jesus, and you are Christians. We know that others hold a different language; but we know not their warrant.

Schleiermacher has so admirably described this state of constitutional, and, we fear, with some, unavoidable scepticism with regard to miracles, with its remedies,—that we shall endeavour to strengthen, by his words, our feebler statement:—

" Even at the present day,—and we cannot ascribe it to hostility against the dealings of God with the human race through Christ,—there are many well disposed persons anxious for the salvation of their souls, to whom the miracles of the Lord are a stumbling block. They say, ' If only these histories were not there,' which always give them a new puzzle, concerning which they can scarcely avoid the thought that they owe their origin to the credulity of the multitude; if only these histories were not there, and the form of the Redeemer, separated from all this, stood before them in the purity of his love, in the power of his word, in the sublimity of his thought, in the certainty with which he spoke of his relation to the father, and told to man what he had learned from God; ' if this alone had been presented to us, divested of all that is miraculous, how easy then,' say they, ' would have been our faith. But now we are always repelled anew by these things; we must suspect the whole narrative, because it is combined with so much that contradicts universal experience and its laws.'

" This certainly is a great unhappiness for a time like our own,—that so many should be attracted on the one side by the needs of their inward experience, and repelled on the other by their judgment on a subject which falls entirely within the province of the understanding. But if this need be only genuine and deeply felt,—may not a soul to which the wished for salvation is presented overcome these merely apparent difficulties? ' Have you not,' I would say to such souls, ' have you not another history which you can set against this? Have you not the historical testimony of the effects which a living communion with the Redeemer has produced on those who lived with him and gave themselves to him? Have you not the wonderful history of the founding of a community through him, by means of such men,—almost without exception uncultivated in the ordinary sense of the word, familiar with no art or science,—as were the disciples of our Lord? Are you not compelled to believe this history, because it is connected with your present experience, because it stands before your eyes, because the whole condition of the world has been decided by its influence? Well, then, if you must believe in this, see that you cherish it. If even now, so far as you open your spiritual eye in love, you can obtain the testimony of those who were rescued from the deepest distress of mind, as soon as they entered into a living relation with the Redeemer of the world; if you can daily repeat this experience, then unlock your hearts, I pray; forget all the blind whose eyes he has opened, the lame whom he has made to walk, the deaf whose ears he has unsealed, the dumb, the bands of whose tongue he has loosed,—forget all the sick whom he has healed; and keep only to these separate histories of his unchangeable influence on the inner nature of man,—keep only to this one history, that the office of preaching reconciliation proceeded from him,—and then you will also be able to believe in the words of the Apostle, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself. ' "

## Art. VIII.—FATHER MATHEW.

It has long been felt that no very extensive and permanent improvement could be effected in the moral and physical condition of Ireland, unless Capital were attracted abundantly to that country, whilst unfortunately the reckless and violent habits of the people have hitherto opposed an almost insurmountable obstacle to its introduction. The only class from whom a good deal might have been expected, the landholders, have unfortunately done but little. Capital might with comparatively little chance of loss have been employed in the improvement and more systematic cultivation of the land; but unfortunately most of the great Irish landlords, being at the same time English proprietors, have looked to their Irish estates as a source of revenue only, and, where they have employed any portion of their surplus means productively, have preferred their English property as a more convenient field for investment; whilst the smaller class of Irish proprietors have rarely found that their revenue was more than adequate to the expenses of their hospitable but profuse mode of living.

The consequence of this state of things has been most deplorable. The land has been cultivated in small plots by an almost countless multitude of small tenants, possessing but little skill or knowledge, and even if they had possessed these qualities, utterly unable from want of capital to make them available. From the irregular nature of their occupation, their mode of life has been the very opposite to one of quiet uniform industry, while their pecuniary reward has been reduced by competition to the very lowest point compatible with the bare support of animal life. It was scarcely possible that these circumstances should not have engendered habits of recklessness and intemperance. Shut out from all domestic comforts, and occasionally in danger of wanting the bare necessaries of life, the Irish peasant has obtained a temporary relief from the wretchedness of his condition by indulgence in physical stimulants; while frequent and unavoidable want of occupation, by multiplying the opportunities, has necessarily tended to strengthen the habit of intemperance. His frequent acts of violence may, with few exceptions, be traced either to intemperance, or to the fear of being driven by the urgent claims of his competitors for land into a state of absolute starvation.

Any direct attempt to increase the means of profitable employment in the various arts of civilized life, amongst a people

who for so long a period have been confirmed in habits of intemperance and violence, can only be very partially successful. The first step must necessarily be to effect a change in their moral habits, and those who have devoted themselves to this task are entitled to the highest praise; for if their efforts should be successful even on a single point, a first step will thereby be gained, from which all the succeeding ones must ultimately follow in a gradually accelerated progression. The smallest change for the better in the habits of the people gives some additional confidence to the possessor of capital, whilst the smallest addition to the productive capital, raises the condition of some portion of the people, and tends to strengthen and extend any moral improvement which may already have been effected among them.

No one who has attended to the course of events in Ireland, for some years past, can have failed to observe, that on two points, and those of great importance, some progress has been made; on one, the improvement has been slow, but it is likely to be permanent; on the other it has been more rapid, but perhaps (until we can speak from a longer experience) there is less certainty of its permanence.

All the peculiar evils of Ireland had for centuries been very seriously aggravated by a lax and partial administration of justice. Of late years the Government of Ireland has certainly not been obnoxious to that charge. The law has been, on the whole, fairly and impartially administered without any systematic leaning to this or that political party, to this or that religious creed. The people have thus been enabled to make one step in the first great lesson of civilized life, (a lesson, which if it be not taught them by their rulers, they can never learn at all,) to respect the law; and great and deserved honour will be given to those who, for an object of such paramount importance to the welfare of the people they were called upon to govern, have patiently submitted to much personal obloquy and misrepresentation. Without this first great preliminary step it seems a matter of doubt whether any attempt of a more direct kind could be successful.

The second great step has been gained for the people of Ireland by the efforts of an individual, who has effected his noble purpose without any aid from station, rank, or wealth. The success of Father Mathew in reclaiming the Irish peasantry from the immoderate use of ardent spirits, (the worst of their vices, because it is the principal source of all the others,) proves in a very striking manner how much may be accomplished by energetic perseverance in some one simple object of great and recognized utility. This now celebrated Parish Priest is a man of

simple habits and unassuming manners, entirely devoid of all merely personal ambition, and possessing no very remarkable talents; and even his oratorical powers, which are considerable, derive their chief force less from any previous cultivation, than from an earnest conviction of the importance and excellence of the work in which he his engaged.

We shall make no apology to our readers, for laying before them a very short account of the labours of this great and good man; the subject cannot fail to be of interest to those who sympathize with the great mass of their Irish fellow subjects.

It was early in the spring of 1838, that a Roman Catholic friar (Father Mathew, as he is usually called,) was prevailed upon by some friends of his, Quakers in the city of Cork, to become a member of a Temperance Society which they had founded there. He had no sooner entered the Society, than he found that its rules were ill adapted to accomplish the purpose for which they had been framed, and with the energy and single-mindedness which are his principal characteristics, he immediately proceeded to remodel it. A new Society was founded on the 10th of April of that year, and the large number of persons who joined it, and the fidelity with which they adhered to their pledge, soon attracted attention in the country surrounding Cork. A report became current amongst the common people that a priest who lived there possessed an infallible cure for drunkenness; their love of the marvellous led them to ascribe his success to supernatural agency, and so rapidly did this belief gain ground, that before the year had elapsed, the high roads leading to Cork from all parts of the country, were daily thronged by people on their pilgrimage (as they called it,) to Father Mathew. For several months, the numbers daily increased, and the distance from which the pilgrims came became greater, until it frequently happened that parties started from a distance of one hundred miles, and came up by regular marches, getting drunk every night as long as their money lasted, which they called taking their farewell of whiskey. The impression which such a journey must have left on the minds of the pilgrims, contributed probably in some degree to the remarkable fidelity with which they adhered to the pledge which was immediately afterwards administered to them. In the summer of 1839 the writer of this account was at Limerick, which had furnished a larger number of pilgrims than any other town of Ireland, and was there informed by persons most likely to be acquainted with the facts, (viz. police magistrates, and masters of manufactories,) that only two persons had, up to that period, been known to violate the pledge, and that of these two persons, one had died,

and the other had gone mad shortly afterwards, which circumstances had incalculably strengthened the pre-existing belief in supernatural agency.

Late in 1839, strong representations having been made to him of the benefits he might confer by proceeding in person to different parts of the country, Father Mathew determined upon visiting Limerick. The crowds of people who flocked into the city from all parts of the adjacent country, and their eagerness to get near enough to see or touch him, is described as most remarkable by the military and the police, who were eye-witnesses of the scene; but what is more extraordinary, no accounts followed of violations of a pledge taken in this hasty manner by hundreds and even thousands at a time. During the remainder of this year Father Mathew visited several other places in the South of Ireland, and in the spring of 1840 he determined to venture upon the great experiment of a visit to the Irish metropolis. The experiment was completely successful; on the last day of the single week that he spent in Dublin, where he had already administered the pledge to no less than 50,000 persons, undiminished numbers were seen pressing forward to the steps of the Custom House, and kneeling down in parties of 1,000 each, bareheaded and in the midst of heavy rain, to listen to the exhortation of the priest, and to repeat after him the words of the promise.* Since that period Father Mathew has successively visited almost every place of importance throughout about two-thirds of the southern division of Ireland; he has made a second visit to Dublin, in the course of which the pledge was administered to about 80,000 persons; and at the beginning of the present year he estimated at upwards of 3,000,000, the total number of persons by whom from first to last the pledge had been taken.†

The proofs of the success of the movement, and of its effect on the general habits of the people, are exceedingly striking. In the year 1840, the falling off in the revenue from excise

* The words of the Pledge are as follows: "I promise to abstain from all intoxicating drinks, except used medicinally, and by order of a medical man, and to discountenance the cause and practice of intemperance." The form of kneeling down bareheaded was adopted by Father Mathew principally for convenience sake, and to preserve order among such great numbers, as well as to make the ceremony more impressive.

† The number of persons to whom, on each occasion, the pledge was administered, was estimated by the police or military, who were always employed to keep order, in the following mode, which does not seem to be liable to any great inaccuracy. The greatest number of persons who could be enclosed within a ring, formed by some given number of the policemen or soldiers, was first exactly ascertained by counting. The pledge was administered to successive batches formed in this way, and the ascertained number of the first batch was assumed as true for all the succeeding ones.

duties in Ireland amounted to £500,000, and from this fact it has been inferred by persons most competent to form an opinion on the subject, that the actual decrease in the consumption of ardent spirits in that year is to the extent of about £1,000,000. The effect of increasing temperance on the frequency of crimes of violence is equally remarkable. The following extract from the returns of crime made to the Government, which are as accurate as unceasing care, and an admirable machinery for the purpose can make them, shows the number of cases of intoxication, and of such other offences as may be considered more immediately to originate in intemperance, in each successive year, from a period prior to the commencement of Father Mathew's labours to the present time.

Return of the number of offences, of each of the Classes mentioned below, as reported by the Constabulary and Committee in Ireland during each of the years mentioned.

| | 1837. | 1838. | 1839. | 1840. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homicide . . . . | 230 | 247 | 189 | 125 |
| Aggravated Assault<br>Assault endangering Life | 958 | 687<br>154 | 501<br>300 | 381<br>196 |
| Assault on Police . . | 91 | 89 | 96 | 49 |
| Faction Fight . . . | 18 | 14 | 20 | 4 |
| Riot . . . . . | 157 | 121 | 85 | 58 |

Return of the undermentioned offences not specially reported by the Constabulary, but summarily disposed of by the Magistrates, or sent by them to trial at Assizes or Quarter Sessions during each of the years mentioned.

| | 1837. | 1838. | 1839. | 1840. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intoxication . . . . | 34,239 | 48,173 | 43,464 | 25,419 |
| Common Assault . . . | 30,380 | 33,901 | 26,305 | 20,793 |

With reference to the second Table, it is important to ob-

serve, that the increase in the number of reported cases of intoxication for the year 1838 is not attributed by the Inspector-General of the Constabulary to an increase in the number of offences of that kind actually committed, but to the effect of a circular which about that period he addressed to the Constabulary, calling upon them to exercise greater vigilance in taking up drunkards.

Comparative Statement of the Number of Persons taken into custody by the Dublin Metropolitan Police for Intoxication and Assaults during the years 1839 and 1840.

| Years. | Intoxication. | Assaults. |
|---|---|---|
| 1839. | 19,236 | 2,850 |
| 1840. | 14,627 | 1,656 |

It is very greatly to the credit of Father Mathew and his co-adjutors, that the Society has been kept entirely free, although not without great difficulty, from any kind of exclusive religious or political feeling. It is open to all without distinction, and amongst its most ardent supporters are to be found persons of all religious persuasions, and of every shade of political party. On the medal there is a religious device of the Paschal Lamb and the Crucifix, with the motto "In hoc signo vinces," but the medal is given only to those who apply for it, and all persons who merely take the pledge from Father Mathew are thereby constituted members of the society. It is a remarkable fact, that he was at first opposed by the clergy of all denominations, and by none more than by those of his own Church; and, although they have been forced into participation and apparent approval by the general enthusiasm on the subject, they still continue to regard the influence which he exercises with some jealousy.

The belief of supernatural power has undoubtedly contributed something to Father Mathew's success, but it is proper to state that he has not himself given the smallest encouragement to any such belief. From the beginning he has uniformly and publicly disclaimed all pretensions to miraculous power for any purpose whatever, and his extraordinary success is, no doubt, mainly attributable to his own simple and energetic character and style of eloquence, and to the actual experience of tens of thousands of his converts of the intrinsic goodness of the cause which he advocates.

The opportunity which the popular enthusiasm has afforded him of making money by the sale of medals has naturally been made the ground for an imputation on him of interested motives. It has been made, however, to a wonderfully slight extent, and only when his name first began to attract attention. Now that all the facts connected with the subject have for a long period been under the observation of the public, the charge is, on all hands, admitted to be entirely unfounded. Wherever a surplus has been left, it has been appropriated to Charitable purposes; but at Cork, the more permanent scene of Father Mathew's labours, the number of medals distributed is so small, as compared with the number of those who take the pledge, that, after paying a salary to the person employed to distribute them, and after carrying to account those which are given to such as are considered too poor to pay for them, no balance has remained applicable to any purpose. Indeed, we have good grounds to believe that, in his private fortune, Father Mathew has been a loser by the cause in which he has been so patriotically engaged. He has certainly given several remarkable proofs of his disinterestedness. It is stated, and we have reason to know truly stated, that some of his nearest relations, who were engaged in business as distillers, have been seriously injured, in a worldly point of view, by the success of the Temperance Movement, and he has himself uniformly declined all those opportunities of personal distinction which his success and consequent celebrity have thrown in his way, from the rare and most praiseworthy fear of lessening his influence with the people, and injuring the great cause which he had undertaken.*

* During his first visit to Dublin, the Lord Lieutenant pressed Father Mathew to dine with him, and told him that he would invite to meet him some persons who were desirous of making his acquaintance, and whom he could hardly have an opportunity of meeting under other circumstances. This invitation he begged to be permitted to decline, excusing himself on the ground of his simple habits, and of the determination he had made to preserve them, from a belief that on that preservation depended, to some extent, his influence with the people, and consequently his success in the work to which he had devoted himself.

ART. IX.—CHILDHOOD, Illustrated in a Selection from the Poets. By H. M. R. London: Harvey and Darton. 1841. 12mo.

CHILDHOOD illustrated by the Poets;—the golden age in the golden light of genius;—those whose souls are ever fresh, sitting by that freshest "well" of living water and discoursing;—the heavenliest minds, telling all they feel and know of the heavenliest form of human nature;—from such a combination of "divine subject," with "the vision and the faculty divine," we must have a collection of the truest poetic things. The title of the book announces the treasures it contains;—Childhood, as regarded, not by this poet nor by that, but—by THE POETS!

The very idea of such a work was singularly graceful and happy, just such an idea as secured its own most successful realization, and which, when it came into the mind of one wishing to contribute something to the lovely and holy influences of domestic life, must have stirred it with a sensation of sudden joy, with the consciousness of the EUREKA, 'I have found it!' There is no other period of life that could thus have concentrated upon itself the Poetic Mind, for there is no other period that has a unity. The fountains of all rivers have a common Genius,—the Nymph might be characterized, but the Rivers,—who will characterize *them*, or reduce them to a unity? the *arrowy* Rhone, the *muddy* Rhine, the *yellow* Tiber, the *majestic* Thames. And so with Man,—he presents one aspect, one character only near the fountain. Let the stream run, and then we get out of Poetry into Potamology.

It was quite impossible that such a Book should not be as beautiful in execution as it was in conception, for it summoned to its aid, throughout all times, the genius of the Poets. At the same time we must express our feeling that THE POETS have not done their duty by so choice a subject. They have not turned their deep eyes into the heart of Childhood. Wordsworth is the only one of THE POETS who has studied childhood; who has *dwelt* upon it with the steadfast, loving, reverential gaze which could alone see into its depths, or do justice to the nature of childhood, so profound yet so elastic, so simple yet so mysterious. In this volume there are only a few lines from Shakspeare, and nothing from Milton, Spenser, Chaucer, Pope.

It is significant of its spiritual beauty, that for the most poetic things ever said of Childhood, we must go to the Saviour of Mankind,—to him who had the deepest insight into

Humanity. "Their Angels do always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven." "Unless ye become as a little child, ye shall not enter the kingdom of God." "Whosoever shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of Heaven." "Whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth *me*."

In selecting one or two Specimens of this rich volume, we shall take, as most interesting, those that are most likely to be new to our readers.

There are some lines, bearing the initials of the editor, addressed to her firstborn son, which are in every way beautiful. We especially admire the holy maternal feeling rising into more elevated sentiment, the mother yielding her son from her loving breast, to purchase for himself a nobler love, by a strenuous life of true service to God and Man. The generosity of the last four lines, the willing surrender of her place to a stranger, is perhaps a little beyond even "mother's love." Has the distance of the day, and the imaginary nature of the vision, not contributed to that self displacement?

*To my firstborn.*

"'Bless thee, may Heaven bless thee, my sweet boy,'
My fond heart whispers oft when none can hear:
Bless thy young face, thy speaking glance of joy,
Thy glowing cheek, where childhood's transient tear
Seldom hath dimmed the smile, to me so dear;
Thy voice, whose bird-like music doth proclaim
The untaught gladness springing in thy breast;
Or now in murmuring tones thy mother's name
Breathes from thy parted lips, when gently press'd
With kiss of holiest love, she lays thee down to rest.

And when by sleep's soft touch thy laughing eyes
Are lightly closed, lingering, I love to gaze
Upon thy peaceful beauty, till arise
Bright visions o'er my soul of future days,
Of boyhood's fearless truth and well-earned praise,
Of youth's first pure and ardent love of all
The good and beautiful in nature found,—
Of manhood, foremost at his country's call,
Her freedom to defend, and see unbound
Chains which too long have borne her children to the ground.

Thus doth my hopeful fancy dare to trace
The bright perspective of approaching years;
For how can I behold that tranquil face,
And think Care's withering touch or Sorrow's tears
Must quench its light? But why these boding fears?

I know that thou in life's distress must share,
But at thy side, the cherished of thy love,
A fond and faithful one I picture there,
Whose gentle voice each sorrow shall remove,
Or lead thy chastened heart to rest in God above!"

There is great repose and finish in the following sonnet by the Rev. J. Johns:—

*On a Child sleeping in a Thunder Storm.*

"Beautiful innocence that thus can sleep,
While the sky flushes pale, like hate in ire;
And near and nearer, deeper and more deep,
The thunder's roar fills up the chasms of fire!
Thou art a Type of that we should desire,
Were our desires and wisdom's one—of peace
Centred within, that no commotion dire
Can from without unsettle—that at ease
(Like the Christ sleeping on the battling seas,
Or thou, beneath the thunder, gentle child,)
Into its own calm depths can turn, and please
Itself with its own heavenly dreams, though wild
The lightnings quiver and the thunders roll:—
Yes, the true fearless is the guiltless soul."

Our last extract must be the following extremely sweet and graceful "Baby's Song," by the Editor:—

"Low-murmured words I hear, mother!
When I am fast asleep,
Which mingle in my dream, mother!
And almost make me weep.

Soft kisses too I feel, mother!
Warm on my lips and eyes,
And a gentle breath upon my cheek,
That on thy bosom lies.

The little angels round me,
My soul with them would keep,
But my heart is linked with thine, mother!
And I waken from my sleep.

I wake—and bending o'er me,
Thine eyes look into mine—
The whispering voice, the loving kiss,
Sweet mother! they are thine."

THE

# CHRISTIAN TEACHER.

---

## Art. I.—SKETCHES OF PAULUS.

*Skizzen aus meiner Bildungs—und Lebens—Geschichte zum Andenken an mein 50 jähriges Jubiläum von Dr. Heinr. Eberh. Gottlob Paulus, grosherzogl. Badischen Geh. Kirchenrath, Professor der Theologie und Philosophie.* Heidelberg und Leipsig. 1839.

*Sketches of my Life and Literary History.* By Dr. H. E. G. Paulus.

This small volume was published by Dr. Paulus in commemoration of the 17th April 1839, the fiftieth anniversary of his appointment to the Professor's chair: a day celebrated among the Germans as a jubilee. A choir, accompanied by some of Dr. Paulus's friends, surrounded his house before sun-rise, and ushered in the day by singing a hymn of welcome composed for the occasion. During the morning various deputations waited on Dr. Paulus and presented him with congratulatory addresses, not only from the several faculties of the University of Heidelberg, but likewise from the theological professors of almost all the Universities of Germany.* These addresses were signed by men entertaining and advocating the most opposite religious views. Dogmatic differences were lost sight of, and Dr. Paulus's warmest friends and his most strenuous opponents seemed alike anxious to express their sympathy with one whose life had been devoted to the investigation and elucidation of truth :—to testify

* We regret to say Berlin was an exception. Dr Marheinecke wished and proposed an address, but his vote was negatived by two of the Professors. Dr. Hengstenberg wrote a letter to Dr. Paulus, alleging as a reason, that it was not usual for the Professors of the University of Berlin to make any public demonstration of their sympathy on such occasions.

their admiration of his candid avowal of opinion, and unswerving adherence to the convictions of his own mind:—and, whilst in many instances dissenting altogether from his conclusions, to acknowledge their full appreciation of the invaluable services rendered by him to theology and to philosophy. On the following day a deputation was sent from the chief magistrate, council, and a committee of the citizens of the town of Heidelberg, to testify their feelings of high esteem and veneration for Dr. Paulus, and their sense of his great merit, and of the services he had rendered to the town and University. This deputation represented the expressed feeling of five hundred of his fellow citizens, who had subscribed a petition to that effect.

On the 2nd of July a deputation arrived, consisting of four gentlemen, of whom two were clergymen, bearing an address from one hundred and eighty-two clergymen and lay members of the Synod, in the twelve Dioceses of Rhenish Bavaria.

We give a few sentences of this address. "Rare are the instances in which to uninterrupted exertion in scientific pursuit, conducted with unusual force of mind, an extraordinary length of duration is also conceded. So much the greater, then, is the gratification experienced by ourselves, and by all who are sincerely devoted to the cause of evangelical light, that this so rare felicity—highly venerated Professor—it has pleased divine Providence to confer upon you." . . . . . "A very large part of the Protestants in Rhenish Bavaria, and amongst them very many of the clergy, who reflect with pride on the privilege they have enjoyed of attending your public instructions, unites with the very numerous body of your admirers, to acknowledge with heartfelt gratitude their sense of your distinguished and meritorious exertions for the extension and advancement of theological science, and of your long combat in the cause of light, of truth, and of justice."

The many addresses received by Dr. Paulus are given at length in this volume. Some of them are in Latin, some in German. They are all written in the same strain of ardent admiration, and breathe the same spirit of grateful love and reverence towards one who seems to be universally recognized by his countrymen as the Master-mind of his age, as well as the most sincere, the most excellent of men.

Dr. Paulus's answers and warm acknowledgments are touchingly beautiful, from the genuine feeling and simplicity they exhibit. The subjoined sketch of his literary history—dedicated by him to all who took part in his jubilee—will be found full of interest by those who are acquainted with the views and writings of this "Apostle of Rationalism."

Dr. Paulus seems to have felt all the difficulty of writing of himself. "The attempt to describe oneself," he says, "is always a hazardous undertaking; yet in old age we feel so different from what we were in our youth, that we are able to look back on our early years almost with the eyes of a stranger: we take as it were a telescopic view of the distant past, and that view is consequently less liable to be a partial one." Yet never was apology less called for; the total absence of egotism—of every selfish consideration—is particularly striking in this most pleasing autobiographical sketch. The singleness of the author's aim is apparent in every page. His object is to show how entirely his religious opinions are the result of earnest and patient inquiry, and of the most sincere conviction. The memoir embodies his particular views, but his anxiety is not so much to enforce these upon others, however true and important they may appear to himself; his most ardent desire is that others should feel as he feels, that *truthfulness—an absolute and fearless faithfulness to conviction, to conviction arising from honest investigation*—is man's highest, most imperative duty; and that in so far only as he is faithful to his convictions, does he act in conformity with the will of God.

Dr. Paulus was born in 1761, at the small village of Leonburg in Würtemberg. When nine years of age, his mother died, and his father being dissatisfied with his progress at the public school, removed him from it, and became his sole tutor. Dr. Paulus dwells with fond and grateful remembrance on these early years, passed under the paternal roof. The father's method of instruction was very admirable, and his own industrious habits and steady application had a most beneficial influence upon the mind of his boy. Paulus's love of reading seems to have been very great. He read indiscriminately all the tales and romances he could lay his hand upon; and when he had exhausted a large store of German books of this description, he ransacked his father's library to discover new treasures. Here he found Fenelon's Telemachus, and an Elzevir Homer with a Latin translation. He read these with avidity, though at that time altogether for the sake of the story. He would often of an evening take refuge in the then vacant study, and by twilight, and even by moonlight, pursue the exciting adventure to the end, till his curiosity was satisfied. The Æneid, though mastered with difficulty, was included in this romance reading; and if much was passed over without being understood, the boy found pleasure in tracing and following the historical thread interwoven with the fiction; and he delighted

greatly in the high-flowing diction, at once grand, sonorous, and rich in thought.

Dr. Paulus thinks this kind of reading, which occupied so many of the leisure hours of his boyhood, was highly useful to him.

"The representations of fictitious circumstances, positions, and exploits, which did not overstep the limits of human possibility, led me always to the contemplation of the actual—matter of fact—historical ground of human existence. I loved the ideal and the noble, but not that which transcended the bounds of the possible. By comparing the fictitious delineations I met with in these works of taste, with historical facts, and real life, I acquired the habit, not only of analysing the wide distinctions which exist in human characters, and of observing the practical influences which they exercise upon each other, but likewise, more especially, of inquiring into the probable causes of actions and events narrated as historical. The more we accustom our minds to the contemplation of that which is humanly possible, the less liable shall we be to take a one-sided view of actual occurrences. Not only shall we find it difficult to persuade ourselves to refer all things to one exclusive source, to good, or to evil; but we shall also discover—what is of the first importance in all historical investigations—that events are rarely the consequence of one solitary cause—that those occurrences which appear to us extraordinary, as well as those which we term ordinary, result from a combination of motives and causes, and *admit of a natural explanation.*"

The father's favourite study was mathematics; he was much habituated to reasoning and demonstration, and he felt particular pleasure in training his boy to take part in logical discussions. He encouraged him to inquire the "wherefore" of all that came under his observation, and incited him, if possible, to seek out the answer for himself. The father had a particularly clear and felicitous mode of expressing himself, and of simplifying his subject. It was moreover a principle with him, and his daily practice, to explain the grounds of any opposition or difference of opinion he might express, studiously avoiding the exaction of a mere submissive acquiescence on the part of his children. Upon one subject however, and upon that alone—rendering the distinction so much the more marked and striking—he pursued an exactly opposite course. If religion, or, more strictly speaking, mysterious matters of belief, came under consideration, any objection raised against the evidences adduced, or the explanations given, invariably disturbed the father's equanimity, and excited his displeasure.

This inconsistency in his father's conduct, this unwillingness

to admit any reasoning or questioning upon the subject of religion, whilst investigation and inquiry were encouraged on all other subjects, produced a powerful effect upon Paulus: it gave birth to many a painful doubt respecting that belief which was so dogmatically taught:—in short it determined the direction of his whole future life.

Dr. Paulus gives an interesting explanation of the cause of his father's intolerance of religious inquiry. We have curtailed the account, but have retained his own words as far as this was possible. How naturally did the superstition of the father engender in the mind of the son that disbelief of the marvellous and the supernatural which constituted him, in maturer age, a Rationalist!

"My father," says Dr. Paulus, "was the officiating clergyman in the small village of Leonburg, and he preached and inculcated the doctrines of his church with affectionate earnestness. He considered them calculated to afford consolation to the many; he thought them essentially beneficial in their moral influence; but above all, he deemed them infinitely superior to the dogmas of the traditional and hierarchical church of Rome, to which he was warmly opposed. The consequence was, he was regarded by his congregation as an eloquent and zealous Christian minister, whilst, in truth, he remained during many years a secret unbeliever. The belief in which he had been educated, appeared to him consistent in itself, but the foundation of all religious belief—the very being of a God—was with him a matter of doubt; he doubted also the existence of a state of consciousness after death. He sought in philosophy a solution of the difficulties which perplexed his mind, but the philosophy of the day—it was that of Wolf—failed to afford him the satisfaction he desired. These doubts, however, were confined to his own breast; they were the subjects of his private meditations. But the unwillingness he evinced to speak of an hereafter, to express any opinion respecting the reality of a future life, could not escape the observation of my actively pious and gentle mother. She suspected that he was sceptical on this point, and in consequence called his attention to a little book containing the histories of certain individuals who, in fulfilment of a promise made in their lifetime, had given signs of continued consciousness after death to the surviving friend. My father objected that the historical evidence of such individual experiences was very slight, and that such testimony was not to be relied on; that these appearances were possibly mere delusions, occasioned by an over-excited state of the brain. Still it is now unquestionable that these highly-coloured representations made a lasting impression on his naturally lively imagination.

"Shortly after this, my mother died at an early age, of an intermittent fever. During her illness my father's mind had been kept in a state of intense anxiety—of constant alternation between hope and fear. The event afflicted him deeply; he was inconsolable. In this hour of affliction his doubts of the existence of a God, and of immortality, became

almost insupportable. Whilst kneeling in the distant and solitary chamber, in front of the bed upon which the corpse of the deceased was laid, he became greatly agitated. He could not endure the thought that the good—the beloved—had actually ceased to be. Could it indeed be possible that she was passed away into an eternal oblivion, into nothingness?

"If there be a God, surely he will deliver me from this dreadful anguish of soul. Such was his thought—his hope. His prayer was a sigh.—Ens entium miserere mei!—In this moment of extreme perturbation, his whole frame trembling violently, and his eyes filled with tears, the corpse suddenly appeared to him to raise itself into a sitting posture, and immediately again sink back. The recollection of a similar apparition mentioned in the little book the deceased had pointed out to him, instantly flashed across his mind. From that moment, and ever afterwards, my father's belief that his wife had designed to give him, through the medium of her corpse, a sign of her continued consciousness, was as confident as his belief that the corpse had appeared to him to raise itself up. Thus in a thousand instances does belief mingle itself with fact. The presumed explanation of the cause, and the actual occurrence, become interwoven with each other, and constitute history. Firm however as my father's conviction was of the reality of the apparition, he has more than once assured me that whilst still kneeling by the bed, he sought to discover whether what he had seen might not have been a delusion, the effect of refraction, his eyes being at the time filled with tears. But he tried in vain to reproduce the same appearance."

"Thus by one single flash and stroke, were my father's metaphysical doubts as it were physically annihilated. That which he believed to have actually happened, and which consequently he could not but regard and hold fast as a fact, together with his own persuasion respecting the cause and design of the occurrence, became so indissolubly connected in his mind, that it ever remained a matter of absolute certainty with him that he had received a sensible demonstration, not only of the continued existence and consciousness of the departed—but also that the deceased retain a recollection of the events of their former life. Now indeed the existence of the Deity—of that Being who had shown mercy to the supplicant, and had vouchsafed an answer to his prayer, could no longer be subject of doubt. The premises, upon which to build that system of theology which had always appeared to him consistent in itself, were now abundantly proved."

"The recurrence of such apparitions to a mind which had once fully admitted their reality, is no-wise surprising. They became increasingly frequent, and in his latter years, visions and significant dreams were almost matters of course: they were the rule rather than the exception."

We have Dr. Paulus's assurance that after the intimate intercourse of many years it was impossible for him ever to entertain the slightest doubt of the perfect sincerity of his father's belief in the reality of all these supernatural apparitions and impressions. On the contrary, his earnest devotion, his honest ad-

herence to his persuasions, the rightness of his intentions, his active zeal, and his persevering, untiring industry, made a deep and lasting impression upon the youthful mind of his son, and inspired him with the truest respect and esteem for his father's character.

The father's religious instructions to his children were conveyed chiefly through the medium of books and discourses. In these readings, however, many things were occasionally advanced which the boy felt to be assertion without proof, and which it was impossible for him to affirm that he believed.

"He earnestly desired to believe, and it was cause of great unhappiness to him that he could not force himself to admit all that was so confidently asserted. He realized the experience that he whose mind has once been awakened to reflection, cannot believe because he may desire to believe: that it is not in the power of any man—however great his anxiety may be to receive one particular view—to compel himself to regard as true, what appears to him either inconsistent in itself, or in contradiction to ascertained and established truths. The boy neither had, nor could have, any distinctly apprehended grounds of doubt, much less did he seek to disbelieve. Most willingly would he have embraced that which he was taught, could it only have been made to appear credible to him. Yet it was impossible for him to attribute to God—to that Being to whom he ascribed all his young mind could conceive of highest and best—those many arbitrary decrees and acts which are so unhesitatingly imputed to the All-good. Moreover, the adduced passages from the Bible did not seem to him always to express that which appeared to him so unworthy of the Divine Being. He heard with how much confidence these interpretations and inferences were maintained; still conviction, such as he experienced respecting many other matters, was not produced in his mind. To persuade himself that he did believe, was to contradict his inward consciousness; yet how often did he endeavour, with childlike simplicity, to compel belief."

He could not venture to confess his doubts and fears to his father, who would not fail to regard his unbelief as disbelief, and to class him among the reprobates who are unworthy of the divine mercy. He continued silent, but became more and more unhappy. His anxiety to know and embrace that which was true, continually increased; and it became with him a fixed and sacred resolve, to make the attainment of individual conviction the primary object of his life. It was this irresistible necessity to satisfy his own mind, which at ten years of age determined him to become a theologian.

This choice was by no means disagreeable to his father, but he was apprehensive lest the displeasure of the ecclesiastical authorities which had fallen upon himself, in consequence of his

visionary persuasions, might be extended to his son, and retard his advancement. These fears proved wholly groundless, but no anticipation of future difficulties would have had any weight in Paulus's mind against the ardent desire he had formed. His resolution was taken, and he pursued the needful preparatory course of study both at the academy and at the university, with a never-failing ardour, and persevering assiduity; the encouragement he met with from his instructors inspiring him continually with fresh energy.

At the age of fourteen the paternal roof and his father's tuition were exchanged for the Kloster-school at Blaubeuren. Here he remained for two years, when he was removed to the upper-school at Bebenhausen, preparatory to his matriculation at the University of Tubingen. Paulus's entrance at a public school was also his initiation into the world. He here first acquired a knowledge of real life. Among his many new experiences, nothing seems to have excited more surprise and disapprobation, than to find a spirit of rivalry and emulation encouraged, and made the stimulus to exertion. He had previously no conception of an ambition growing out of envy. Taught by his father that a thing was to be done because it was in itself desirable or right, he knew no other impulse to exertion than the desire to possess that inward satisfaction which ever rewards our best efforts.

We cannot follow him step by step through his academical career. This portion of the memoir contains much that is valuable respecting the course of study best calculated to prepare the mind of the student for theological investigation. He speaks of Professor Ploucquet's lectures on theoretical philosophy with particular approbation and gratitude. It was the method invariably adopted by that professor, of distinguishing between that which is in its own nature necessarily true, and that which can be considered only as more or less probable, which served to strengthen and confirm the previous direction of Paulus's mind, and it became with him an habitual aim in all his studies, in every branch of inquiry, to obtain inward conviction of the true, independent of all dogmatical and theoretical opinions and speculations.

Dr. Paulus distinguished himself at the University, but his health suffered from his intense application. His next years were spent in travelling. For this advantage he was indebted to the liberality of *Freiherr von Palm*, who was in the habit of devoting yearly a considerable sum to literary and scientific objects. Paulus had been favourably spoken of to this gentleman, and he most unexpectedly received from him a remittance which

enabled him to visit many of the German Universities, and to extend his travels to England. At Oxford he devoted himself to the study and transcription of some of the Oriental Manuscripts which he found in the Bodleian Library. This service probably led to his appointment, shortly after, in the year 1789, to the Professorship of Oriental Languages at Jena.

In 1794 he was made Professor of Theology, but in 1804 he was removed from Jena to Würzburg on account of his health. In 1811 he was called to fill the vacant chair, as Professor of Theology and of Philosophy at Heidelberg. He was also constituted Privy-Counsellor of the Ecclesiastical Court of Baden.

Dr. Paulus was now to be the teacher of others, and most ably and conscientiously did he fulfil his mission. To trace the natural harmony between the Bible and human reason—to separate the essentially true and permanent in Christianity, from the opinions and notions incident to the age in which they took their rise—to distinguish between the religion of Jesus, and the dogmas of the fathers and scholastics, and to assign to the latter their proper value—these were the objects he proposed to himself in his public lectures.

But we will quote his own words on the duty and importance of religious inquiry, on the love of truth, and the adequate capabilities of the human mind for the attainment of truth.

"To submit each individual point of belief to a severe scrutiny—to search out the agreement of each separate position with all other recognized truths—to ascertain that *the probable* is in complete and rational harmony with the true—is a duty as imperative in religion as in every other branch of inquiry. This is the highest duty of the right thinking and rightly disposed mind; and its prosecution in regard to religion is rendered less difficult because, in matters of religious conviction, we are protected against superstition on the one hand, and disbelief on the other, by two considerations; viz., whether that which is asserted to be true accords, in the first place, with the notions we form of the divine perfections, and, secondly, with the knowledge man has of himself—of his own nature. But a love of ease must not lead us to admit those decisions,—those theological and dogmatical opinions, which have been handed down to us, as if they were infallible, whilst we never permit the investigation of the true, in any other department of science, to be suspended. In availing ourselves of that which has been transmitted both in religion and in theology, we must neither suffer ourselves to be seduced into stationary acquiescence, nor allow the want of infallibility to drive us to despondency: we must guard ourselves equally against the believing nothing, and the believing every thing."

* * * * *

"And what is the purest love of truth? Is it not the unfettered

striving of the mind to attain to a right conviction respecting all that is—in small things, as well as in great? What do we mean by *absolute certainty*? In what does it consist but in this; that the opinion which we conceive to be true is found to be substantiated by every argument which presents itself to the mind, and can likewise be brought into unconstrained harmony with those truths of which we are already convinced?"

"But a consciousness of absolute certainty is attained to, then only, when the individual mind, dismissing all its individual accidents, its peculiarities, passions and inclinations, exerts those powers of apprehension and of judgment, which it possesses in common with all others of the race, who likewise, releasing themselves as far as possible from disturbing and distorting individualities, strive to think and judge correctly. We cannot apprehend an object in its actual purity—such as it really is. All knowledge is subjective, is to be attained only through the medium of the conceptive and reflective powers. That which is essential, therefore, is, that we separate our own accidental individualities (the peculiarities of the individual mind) from those faculties which we, as human beings, possess in common with all men. Let but these faculties, which are common to all, be exercised and applied wholly unfettered and unbiassed by individual peculiarities, and with regard to their universal validity for all who, as members of the human race, are able and willing to reflect, no ground of doubt will remain. However willingly we would persuade ourselves that we arrive at something beyond mere human certainty, by soaring into the region of the ideal—by aspiring after the superhuman—absolute—the fact is, we obtain conviction by a constant careful investigating belief on ourselves—on our own powers, in as far as we are able, both in thinking and determining, to raise ourselves above that which is individual, to that which is subjective—to that which is universally, generically subjective. And in such manner only can we exercise the human capabilities, in their fullest application, to the attainment of a more perfect measure of truth. To the inquirer after truth, nothing is more requisite than that he should frequently realize this only possible mode of becoming humanly certain of the true, and that he should judge of its applicability to widely different objects according to their diversity. This is why we find the acutest thinkers have ever been so much occupied with the *methodus inveniendi verum*."

Dr. Paulus gives a long account of his mode of studying and interpreting the writings of the Apostles—of the manner in which he was gradually led to reject the commonly-received notions, and particularly the orthodox doctrine of "Justification by Faith." He writes—

"I clearly perceived that in the writings of the Apostle, and in them alone, were to be sought the Apostolic principles of distinction between blind faith in dogmas, and that faithfulness to conviction—to the belief of the mind, which is saving faith; and which is possible alike to all men; and which, according to Paul, is as pleasing to God in Abraham, as it is in the Christian, who, since the teaching of Jesus, possesses so

much better means of knowing, and of practising all that is requisite to spiritual righteousness."

"It was long before I could free my mind from the commonly held opinion that salvation depends on the belief of that which is objective—on adherence to the matters comprised in a given creed, and consequently upon what is not an affair of the will. According to the Old Testament tradition, which knows nothing of *Types*—of a belief in a Christ and his doctrines, through the medium of typical representations—the belief which Abraham had must have differed widely from that belief which the early Christian would have, through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. And yet in the Epistle to the Romans* that kind of faith which Abraham had is set forth as the pattern of universal saving faith."

"I had always attributed consecutive reasoning, and the power to convince, to the most argumentative among the Apostles, who, not satisfied to rely upon mere assertion, constantly aimed to produce inward conviction. Again and again I sought, but did not find the usual notion of *faith*:—namely, assent to certain revealed matters of belief—in the reasoning and deductions of the Apostle; till at length, by continually going back to the original positions, it became quite evident to me that the two principal words upon which the whole question depended, '*Righteousness*' and '*Faith*,' had been wrested (by the fathers and scholastics) from their proper primitive moral signification, and had been made to receive a forced and theoretical meaning. Δικαιοσυνη signifies that which constitutes actual righteousness—or the aim of the thinking and determining mind, in the first place, to attain to full and resolute rightness of intention, and then to realize an undeviating adherence to that which is right in reference to action. This '*righteousness*' Paul terms, 'the righteousness of God,' since it does and must belong to God, and because God wills that such righteousness shall be produced in the hearts of men, by means of thought working conviction, and by means of volition—the resolving to be faithful to that conviction. But this Bible expression is commonly misconstrued and so interpreted as if God considered those as righteous and consequently as *justified*—goodness and uprightness being imputed to them—who admit and experience a certain given belief on the person of Christ."

"I found on the contrary, that in primitive, apostolic Christianity, true, essential righteousness of heart was required of every man, and that it was attainable by all, even by him who possessed the smallest portion of insight—if he would only form and hold fast, the determination first to acquire inward conviction of the right and the good, and resolve to live in faithful conformity to that conviction—and as soon as I found that it was possible in each instance to interpret the expression of the Apostle in the sense of '*a righteousness which was pleasing to God*,' it became evident to me that this must be the incontrovertible meaning of the language of the Epistles; and that δικαιοσυνη signified *that actual righteousness* which the All-knowing discerns in the heart—*and not a*

* Rom. iv. 1—24.

*true profession in him whose heart is not upright before God.* In a similar manner I gained a clear apprehension of the notion of *Pistis, faith.* In order with entire faithfulness—conviction and faithful application—to arrive at the true Scriptural notion of saving faith, it is needful to bear in mind that πειθεσθαι, as well as *persuaderi,* signifies something more than simply to be convinced. All religious communities have some particular words which they employ to express their own peculiar notions. These words are borrowed indeed from the common language, but are used idiomatically when applied to their particular views. The theologian is too regardless of the primitive Christian idiomatic sense of words, if he content himself with explaining them in the familiar sense which they bear in general, every-day intercourse.

" Πιστευειν, 'to manifest oneself (πιστος),' 'to believe,' signifies commonly that state of mind in which a thing is regarded as true from a feeling of confidence—upon trust. The Christian *faith* is unconstrained, originates in confidence, yet not without real grounds, both internal and external. It arises from *thinking,* and at the same time *willing* that which is right; consequently it is not conviction only, but conviction combined with fidelity to conviction—the honest determination to will according to conviction. And it is he only who has that disposition of mind which ever wills to be convinced of all that is truly good and divine, in order that he may in his life observe unswerving faithfulness to that conviction, who possesses the righteousness which the Apostle describes as εκ πιστεως εις πιστιν,—as arising out of faith, and ever resulting in faith. It is that frame of mind which induces faithfulness to its own convictions, which constitutes inward, ever newly self-realizing righteousness.

" But it is religion, or devotion of the heart to God, which in all cases engenders this steadfastness in thinking and willing that which is right, and this faithfulness the Christian religion, *as a universal religion,* renders possible to all, though Christians must ever differ respecting the subject matter of their belief, since distance of time and place, inequality in the powers of apprehension, variety of degree in mental advancement, will ever produce differences of opinion. Yet the very desire to attain to a sincere conviction is in itself a security against a too wide diversity of belief, as well as against indifference and levity. For nothing which is a matter of conviction can be of light moment to him who strives to act in conformity with his conviction; and most assuredly his mind will easily progress, and rise without difficulty from that belief which Abraham had, to that far more excellent belief which is become manifest through Jesus Christ.* But that which Abraham believed, no less than that which the Christ of God believed, is sufficient for salvation, if embraced with Abraham's immoveable determination of purpose to sacrifice all to fidelity to that belief."

" By careful study I likewise became persuaded, that the Apostle's notion of the origin of sin—of which the universality is undeniable—did not comprehend either an inherited, or in any way imputed sin, but

* This is the transition indicated by the Apostle, Rom. iv. 24, 25.

precisely that which self introspection discovers to every unprejudiced mind. To pursue the right, to do good, is far more difficult than to do evil: but 'lust or covetousness' is only regarded by Paul as sin, when a man is conscious of the conviction that such desire ought to be resisted, and yet, nevertheless, determines to yield to it, and thus allows himself to swerve from that faithfulness to conviction upon which righteousness depends.

"It is, however, sufficiently evident, that Paul ascribes the entrance of sin and of death among men (that is, the introduction of both evils into the world, and not the entering of sin into human nature) to the time of the first pair, but he does not therefore maintain with the scholastics—more especially as the passage in Genesis does not reveal one word to that effect—that *in consequence of* the first transgression, *sin* passed upon all men. Paul, on the contrary, truly and distinctly affirms, that *death* passed upon all men; but why? *because that all have sinned:* all men, both with and without the law."

"Man is born a sensual being, and learns only by slow degrees to will in obedience to the dictates of his reason, and he is consequently ever liable to sin, and this, according to the Bible explanation, is the cause wherefore, in the divine order of nature, it is appointed that man shall put off his mortal body—shall die. Did each individual continue always in the same corporeal state of existence, in that one stage of being, in which condition, before he had yet attained fixed determination of purpose, he has frequently acted in opposition to his better knowledge—he would always remain too much subjected to the influence of those early years of self-discipline."

"The leading idea in the Apostle's writings, *that the righteousness which is pleasing to God consists in fidelity to conviction*, led me also to understand the true signification of another point of doctrine, treated of in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians.

"I now clearly discerned on what grounds Paul so strenuously contends against the too human and Judaical practice of doing a thing only because it is commanded in God's law,—whereas it is a full conviction of the rightness and goodness of the command which can alone produce a real acquiescence. Love to God and devotion to his will is the fervent spontaneous feeling *of him only* who determines to bring every thought and action into harmony with that will, not from a sense of fear, not from a hope of reward, but from a deep inward conviction that He is the Highest Good."

We must quote another passage from this portion of the volume, giving Dr. Paulus's view of the Messiahship of Jesus.

"It is usual to understand and to explain the New Testament writings as if they insisted merely or chiefly on the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah. But it is too little borne in mind that this belief of his Messiahship was of highest moment on this account—it served to fix the attention of his contemporaries, and of the Jews in particular, both in and out of Palestine, upon Jesus, and to induce an earnest reverence

for his authority. It was in the character of Messiah that Jesus was able by means of his teaching, his life, and his entire faithfulness to conviction, even unto death—the painful death of martyrdom—to guide his followers to the kingdom of God. The acknowledgment, that Jesus was '*the Christ of God,*' was important *as a means to an end.* Jesus required belief on him as the Messiah, in order that the confident persuasion that he taught and acted in the character of Messiah might lead the believer to the conception of a spiritual kingdom of God—of a spiritual worship of God—a worship consisting in the devotion of the heart to that which is in itself true."

"The notion of a 'Messiah,' or 'Anointed' of Jehovah, as it has at all times been understood by the Jews, included the obligation on the part of the Messiah to regard himself, and to deport himself, as the sub-regent of God. As such he was to govern God's people in a manner pleasing to God, and to bring them into entire conformity with the will of God."

"The New Testament represents Jesus as the Messiah in the highest and truest sense:—not as seeking to establish the kingdom of God described by the later Prophets, a kingdom in which the power of Jehovah should be manifested in the subjection of all nations to her Temple, and the people of the Temple—but as aiming to produce an internal revolution in the hearts of men, by means of conviction:—conviction of the holy spirituality required by God, and of the paternal love of the Heavenly Father. The Evangelists undoubtedly insist upon the recognition of the Messiahship of Jesus, but altogether with this view—that men may be led through belief on Jesus, *as the Christ,* to God, 'that God may be all in all.'"

A spirit of free inquiry had been already awakened in Germany before Dr. Paulus appeared upon the field of religious controversy. It was however reserved for him to carry out to its fullest extent that system of interpretation which Eichhorn and others had applied to the Old Testament Scriptures. It was between 1773 and 1778, that Lessing published, at Wolfenbüttel, the "Fragments of Reimarus." This bold step produced a powerful movement throughout the entire German theological world. Suspicion of divers pious frauds had been thrown upon the early history of Christianity, and many of the most distinguished theologians found it impossible to escape the conclusion that the Reformers, though they had recognized the uncertainty and invalidity of *tradition,* in so far as it was made the foundation of Popish abuses, had nevertheless too readily, and without investigation, admitted the authority of tradition in matters of history, and upon those points of belief upon which the Reformed and Roman Catholic churches had not come into collision, and more especially upon the critical question concerning the origin and authenticity of the New Testament writings.

Is it admissible to regard an author as a near witness of an event from which he is removed several generations? Is the testimony of a great grandson as to what his great grandfather thought, believed, and experienced, to be relied on? particularly if this descendant does not state upon what grounds a tradition, current in his day, appeared to him credible. And are such considerations to be altogether overlooked in weighing the scanty evidence of Justin Martyr, and of Irenæus?

A further investigation respecting the date, genuineness, and authenticity of the New Testament text was now become unavoidable. It was not to be denied that no one knew by whom, in that early period of Christianity, of which there is no history,—but during which some of the principal churches (those of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus, and Rome) came into existence—these Scriptures were discovered, edited, declared to be authentic, and constituted the guide in all matters of church instruction and doctrine. No one knew upon what grounds, and after what examination, these Gospels had been recognized as genuine, nor how far the alterations of transcribers, &c., had been strenuously guarded against, or carelessly permitted.

"Often must a secret conviction have intruded itself upon the mind, that these points had been assumed and treated as matters of certainty from a feeling of the extreme importance that they should be implicitly believed. How frequently are the most weighty questions, particularly in theology, disposed of in his manner: it was wished that the thing might be so, it was of highest moment that it should have been so—in short it was so, it must actually have been so, have happened so."

It was about the year 1784, that Paulus's attention was directed to these Fragments, and the various investigations and controversies to which they had given rise; and he acknowledges that they had considerable influence on his opinions, and the expositions given by him in his public lectures.

"In judging of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, I began to distinguish between the religious doctrines and precepts—partly essential, and partly relating to the opinions of the time,—which they have transmitted to us. I saw that the former were in themselves immutably true, or were, at any rate, characterized by a high degree of relative probability. That it was consequently of small importance by whom, upon what grounds, or upon what assumptions,—in what words, and in what dress belonging to the age, these truths had been set forth and brought into clearer light. The conviction that *the true is true on account of its own intrinsic truth*, and not on account of him who proclaims it, had already at this time forced itself upon my mind—a conviction which the researches of my whole life have served to strengthen and confirm.

"Let the religious instructor never represent that which is in itself essentially true, as if its truth depended upon the external circumstances and history of its communication; however important these may be as directing attention to the truths conveyed. It is the fault of the teacher if either his own or his hearer's belief in a religious doctrine or precept be made to rest upon an historical tradition, or a transmitted text. These, indeed, make known the doctrine, but they do not constitute it true or false; neither can the uncertainty which may attach to the record in anywise affect that which is inherently true."

"It is much to be regretted that the church has always represented the only saving faith as deriving its truth from external authority. Christians are therefore accustomed, from childhood, to regard the inherently true—the essential in religion—as if its truth depended upon the miraculous—the supernatural by which it is accompanied. Divest their faith of the incomprehensibilities by which it is supposed to be supported, and you destroy it. Their belief is based upon the marvellous, a species of evidence which is in its nature transitory; or else it is grounded upon the artificial and complicated evidence derived from miracles—a chain of almost interminable length. The consequence is, that the moment you question the foundation you appear to them to bring religion itself into danger. They do not reflect that we feel wonder only because we are ignorant of the cause which has produced a result we know not how to account for; that, could we ascertain all the circumstances of the case, the probability is that the connection between the cause and effect would at once become apparent to us. This is particularly true with respect to occurrences of which we possess only a very incomplete detail. We have a narrative of some certain facts—we find it impossible to account for these given facts, and we infer the presence of miraculous agency—that is to say, because we are unable to discover the *natural* operating causes, we suppose and conclude the cause to be necessarily *supernatural*. Let us take an example. In the Gospel of Matthew, we read that Jesus walking by the sea of Galilee, called four fishermen from their employment, and from their aged father: that these men not only immediately left their nets and followed Jesus, but that they became the most zealous amongst his disciples. This calling of these four men, apparently strangers, appears, when thus briefly narrated, without further explanation, sudden and unaccountable, so altogether unnatural, that it must often have excited great surprise, did not the Gospel of John inform us that these men were already disciples of the Baptist, and that they had been taught by him to acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah—of whom John was the forerunner, who should prepare his way before him. We find also, that they returned to their occupation of fishing till such time as Jesus should require them to be his constant companions.

"By studying such examples, quite unfettered by secondary considerations, anxious only to seek out the truth, I soon learned to inquire, in all cases, whether because no adequate natural causes were assigned by the Evangelists for the facts they record, it was therefore to be assumed that no natural causes had produced them. Was it not ad-

missible to entertain the suspicion that these men had in some instances omitted to state the natural causes—seeing that to narrate circumstantially and satisfactorily what had happened was matter of difficulty to them ?

" In my first course of lectures I adhered undeviatingly to the following rules of exposition.

" First, Most accurately to compare the given circumstances, in order as far as possible to ascertain from the record itself what might have been the originating cause of the facts narrated.

" Secondly, Whenever explanatory causes failed, or were not discoverable, to abstain from substituting mere suppositions.

" Thirdly, As rigorously, on the other hand, to reject the conclusion, that because we are left in total darkness respecting the natural causes, *that therefore no natural causes had existed.*"

" Before we are justified in referring events to an unknown agency—to the immediate operation of a spiritual and invisible power—it must first be made apparent not merely that we are ignorant of the natural operating causes, but that no natural cause can be assigned."

" The narratives in the Gospels are so simply and naturally told, that a person, habituated to close historical investigation, will frequently be able to recognize, in these short representations, traces of the manner in which the events came to pass; indeed, far oftener than might on a first reading have been expected. A large proportion of the cures which Jesus is recorded to have wrought, relate to the casting out of devils. A careful examination and consideration of the accounts given in the Synoptics, of the first cure of this description, convinced me that Jesus had not originated this species of healing; and also that the occasion for working this cure had not been sought after on his part. The Gospels relate that Jesus, after that he had been teaching with great effect in the synagogue—for all were amazed—was suddenly accosted by a man, standing there, who supposed himself to be possessed by an unclean spirit. This man, recognising, in him who could preach with so much power, 'the Christ,' and connecting and identifying himself with the devil within him, was alarmed, and gave utterance to the fear that had seized him. His exclamation signified his belief, which as a Jew he naturally entertained—that the evil spirit within him must now retire—that it would no longer be able to retain its hold on him, in the presence of the Holy One of God."

" Jesus did not seek to work this cure, much rather does it appear that the healing of the possessed was, in this first instance, forced upon him, though the same kind of cure was often subsequently repeated by him for the benefit of those suffering under similar delusion. Many believed they were possessed by demons, who would be forced to retire at the command of 'the Christ.' Thus did a previously existing, and at that time prevailing notion furnish Jesus with frequent opportunities for the exercise of benevolence. It does not follow from this that Jesus regarded the possession of devils, and the evil effects produced on the human frame, as a physical malady. That such was not his view is, I think, undeniable; first, because the whole of the New Testament pre-

supposes the existence and power of devils; and, secondly, because Jesus nowhere explains this mode of cure to his disciples as medical. On the contrary, he seems to acquiesce in and sanction the general notions of the day."

The journey to Emmaus was a matter which engaged the attention of the theologians at this time. Lessing had asked, "How could he whose feet had been nailed to the cross, on the third evening after his crucifixion, walk to Emmaus?" Dr. Paulus enters into the inquiry at considerable length. The chapter is too long and too critical for insertion in these pages, but it is highly interesting to the biblical student—and it puts the reader in possession of Dr. Paulus's method of investigation. He was accustomed invariably, when any difficulty, inconsistency or apparent contradiction, was to be accounted for or explained, to return again and again to the first position, and never to admit an inference before the primary fact had been fully proved. In this particular instance he annihilates the objection itself, by showing, first, that it was not customary to nail the feet of the crucified; and, secondly, that there is no sufficient evidence that the feet of Jesus were nailed. The twenty-second Psalm having been interpreted as prophetic of Jesus, the exact fulfilment of the prophecy was a necessary consequence, and was therefore readily assumed.

Dr. Paulus's life was devoted to biblical study, and exposition. The results of his learned and indefatigable researches are given to the public in his numerous works: it being his constant habit to write on the different subjects of religious inquiry which, from time to time, came under his consideration. In 1800 he published his "Commentary on the Gospels," and in 1828 his "Life of Jesus." A rationalistic interpretation of portions of the Scriptures had already been given by other theologians, so that the way was in a measure prepared; but Dr. Paulus was the first who attempted to give a complete and systematic *Rationalistic* explanation of the Gospel histories—of the life of Jesus as recorded by the Evangelists.

His inquiries led him to the opinion that the Gospels furnish satisfactory internal evidence, that they were written at a date not far removed from the events which they record. In this he dissented from the then predominating opinion amongst the free-thinking German theologians,—that the Synoptics were the fragmentary production of a later age.—It was consequently impossible for Dr. Paulus to admit that the Gospel narratives belong to the class of myths, poetical fictions, or legends: no sufficient period, according to his view, having intervened between the events, and the record of them, to allow of the formation of

*Mythi.* On the contrary, he maintains that the record is based upon historical truth—that it is a history of facts, intermingled indeed with the notions of the writers, and of the age in which they lived. The primary duty of the biblical inquirer therefore is, to distinguish between fact and opinion—between that which actually occurred, and the witness's or writer's impression and explanation of the causes of the occurrences. The New Testament was written at a time when every extraordinary event, every phenomenon, of which the causes were not understood, was attributed to supernatural intervention. Consequently in the accounts given by the Evangelists, fact and judgment are found intimately interwoven with each other, and it is the task of the historical investigator to separate them—to distinguish the one from the other—to disengage the kernel from its shell. This is to be done, by endeavouring to realize the scene of action, as it appeared to the eye-witnesses of that age, to view the circumstances from the same point from which they were contemplated by the narrator. Thus he may hope to discover what may have been those natural operating causes which the individuals present, and the historian —habituated to refer all extraordinary occurrences to immediate divine agency—did not notice or take account of.

Rationalism represents the evangelical account of the life of Jesus as a chronologically connected detail of actual occurrences —whilst at the same time it divests the history altogether of its supernatural character and contents.* The whole history, and each separate event, admit of a natural rational explanation. Jesus is not the "Son of God" in the orthodox sense—he is not even a being endowed with more than human powers, he is a wise and virtuous man. His acts of mercy are not miracles—they are deeds of benevolence which accidental circumstances favoured and allowed, or they are medical cures which his knowledge and skill enabled him to perform.

The age of Rationalism forms an epoch in the history of religious opinion; but it is now on the decline in Germany. It found acceptance for a while, and was supported by some of the ablest theologians of the day—yet, after a full and fair examination, it is shown to be inadequate to furnish the desired explanation of the Evangelical writings. Dr. Paulus may almost be said to have outlived the system which he so learnedly and so conscientiously advocated; but the influence of his truthful life will live in coming generations; and the services he has rendered to the cause of truth in advancing theological science, and in pro-

* [We may observe that Rationalism, in this peculiar sense, has long been considered untenable, and is now fast declining in Germany.—Ed.]

moting freedom of inquiry, will be as permanent as they are invaluable. For many years he has ceased to give public lectures, but his intellects still retain their wonted vigour, and his energies and his pen are still devoted to the improvement and illumination of his fellow beings.

In the beautiful words of his admired friend Goethe,

"Like as a star
That maketh not haste
That taketh not rest
Is he ever fulfilling
His God-given Hest."

E. R. B.

## Art. II.—JOSEPH BLANCO WHITE.

The love of Truth is the highest form of the love of God. The religious affections may mislead, or they may arise from causes of a physical nature,—but a pure devotion to Truth is the submission of all that is in Man to the eternal Source of Thought,—the sublime reliance of the Soul, unbribed by interest or passion, upon whatever it believes to have proceeded from that infinite Intelligence who is the Fountain of our spirits. There is no surrender to God so complete, as that which is made by him who worships the Father in spirit and in truth,—whose God is Reality,—who uses no artificial means to keep up fluctuating and fluttering feelings that have no basis in his Reason, but casts all idols out of his heart, and like Abraham, stripped of his household gods, goes forth in faith to meet the untried future, knowing only that the great God has shown him of his spirit, and that to trust in Truth is to take refuge with the Father of Lights.

The love of God in the form of the love of Truth ensures the most genuine products of the devotional Spirit;—the hope of progress, which is the root of all true humility;—the practical fidelity of the Conscience;—and, what results from these, the trusting and childlike quiet of the heart. Christ himself has connected the sentiment of Immortality, of indefinite progress for the soul, with the worship that identifies God with Truth: "whosoever shall drink of this water, it shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." Immortality necessarily suggests ideas of Progress; and to love and obey the Truth are the only means by which our feeble Reason can approach to the Thoughts of God. These too are the sources of Fidelity in temptation; of sublime peace in life and death. Who steers his course so direct towards arduous Duty as he who believes that he has no safe guide but Principle,—and, when this is clear, puts away from him, as false and unfilial, all deceitful reasonings about uncertain consequences,—and feels that in following a moral Truth he is committing himself to the Love of an All-wise God? Who in the hour of agitation or death is so free from alarm of *soul*, as he whose peace with Heaven depends not on the vehemence of his belief in abstract propositions, or the chance temperature of unstable feelings, but on the sincerity with which his inward being cleaves to a spiritual God? Our Lord Jesus Christ, whose Comforter and God was the Spirit of Truth, and who described it as his Mission in the world, "to bear witness to the Truth that he knew," is the one example of perfect fidelity

in difficult Duty, and of heavenly peace of soul in all times of trial. In the midst of a Religion of prescription, and of Authority, and of Ritual, and of Enthusiasm, and of all other substitutes for the inner communion of the Soul with God, he alone, who trusted to the Truth to make him free, was established on the Rock, and could meet every crisis of his life with the strength of one supported by God, " not my will, but thine be done,"—and close his martyr death with the childlike trust, " Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit."

Whosoever has not the spirit of Christ is none of his. And there is no spirit so worthy to be called " the spirit of Christ" as this practical trust, this committal of ourselves to the convictions of our Reason and the monitions of our Conscience,—identifying them with God who is their Source. There are causes connected with the individual mind, and altogether independent of the undue influences of Society that render unfailing Devotion to Truth the most arduous form of the true worship of God,—causes arising out of the infirmities and even the tenderness of our nature,—the surrender of the mind to the prejudices of Education; the natural sloth of the Intellect; and the lingering residency of the Affections amid the sentiments and images where Faith first found a home. And Society which, alas, is but collective Man, with all the faults of the individual reduced to system, and sanctioned by numbers,—Society lashes us in the direction of the very tendencies which it ought to restrain, and adds the whole weight of its bribes and terrors to the difficulties which our own souls present, in the spiritual work of seeking and worshipping God under the form of Truth. That tyranny of the Imagination which in spiritual things fastens upon the mature mind the images of childhood; that sloth of the Intellect which falls away from the toil of conceiving God, and forfeits its filial inheritance of growing access to the Parent Light; and that contraction of the affections which clings to the familiar and the known without inquiring whether it is the true, and the pure, and the holy, and the lovely,—these, which are in reality the infirmities of our nature, Society has exalted into religious virtues of the highest order, and lent itself to the pernicious work of consecrating our weaknesses before God, by punishing as impiety, to the utmost of its power, every attempt to gain new light on the subject of Religion, to draw deeper water from the wells of Christ, and to think freshly of the Almighty. So totally has that portion of Society which deems itself eminently Christian given up all thoughts of improvement in the knowledge of Religion, that the very supposition that there *is* any thing to be added to their knowledge of God and of

Christ is, in their eyes, a Heresy. This is the radical evil of all dogmatic systems, that they sanctify the natural sloth and stagnation of our spiritual powers,—and that they designedly excite the persecution of Society against the man who reverently lifts his soul to the infinite God, and professes a faith in the possibility of new communications from His unexhausted Truth.

It is indeed most painfully descriptive of the state of Religion in this Country that an act so simple as the honest expression of Opinion should, by artificial difficulties, be elevated into a rare virtue,—that in this respect it should still be with the servant as with his Lord,—and that fidelity to conscience, though not actually led to the cross, should yet have its more refined and lingering martyrdom. It would seem to be the most natural of moral occurrences, and certainly not marked with any extraordinary merit, that a man should speak as he felt,—and having in simplicity sought the Truth, should in simplicity declare what he had found. But the sectarian spirit in Society, the spirit of Churches under every form, has subjected to the severest temptations that simple honesty which would otherwise be a matter of course, the unprompted expression of the soul; so that the reverence for Truth which meets unmoved the frowns and seductions of that spirit, and pays its single obedience to inward conviction, deserves to be signalized, for it is rare indeed. Christians, while they profess a great regard for the Truth of Christianity, have shown very little regard for the only Christian truth a man can know any thing of,—*truth to himself*,—and while they pray that he may be led into the Truth, they surround his path with every temptation to become a deceiver. Why was that venerable Confessor, for no less he was, whose worn remains were lately committed to the peaceful grave in Liverpool, in the presence of a few, who came to honour Truth in a Christian man, and to supply, as far as may be, with silent Reverence, the place of long familiar Love,—why was he, in his own pathetic words, in feebleness, in sickness, and in sorrow, "made a beggar for kindness?" In the name of Christian humanity, what was there in the mere circumstance of his having adopted some of our opinions, to place him exclusively within the range of our personal intercourse, and to make him a dependant on our sympathies? We think these questions *ought* to be put,—and answered by those whom they concern.*

* The writer of these notices would be doing great injustice to the friends of Blanco White who belong to the Church of England, if he produced the impression that their *affections* were alienated from him by his religious opinions. He has reason to know that their friendship, and love, and generous care for him, never ceased. He would be understood therefore only to speak of the *necessities of system*, as manifested

Why came he to Liverpool in the last stage of worn life to make his home with strangers? Why was he, with that noble heart so formed to love, and where he loved to instruct and bless, an almost solitary man, over whose head whole days and weeks passed in which he had no happiness but what he drew from Conscience, and only not alone because his Father was with him? Why should that which it was his Christian duty to do be visited with such cruel penalties? Why should a change in his views of objective Truth, necessitate a change in all the circumstances of his life, and in all the daily friendships of his heart? Is this the way in which Christians express their reverence for Truth, by cruelly punishing every honest expression of it? We speak not of individuals, but of the Spirit of Systems. But this is the retributive stab which the dogmatism of the Intellect inflicts upon the heart. Whoever erects himself into a Judge of saving truth, withers his own affections for all who refuse his Tribunal. Those who presume to *know* God's judgments will act accordingly. They will not love those whom God does not love. And this is the social spirit of Orthodoxy!

And that these are feelings which we do not impute to him, but which actually embittered every day and hour of the last years of his life, we can produce most affecting evidence. It appears from his Journal, that on one occasion, he attended in that humble burying ground where now some of the most honoured of the earth repose, brought there by the same desire to pay respect to *humanity* which lately led others to his own grave. We will extract the record of his feelings on that occasion: it will make him known better than the descriptions of another.

*Liverpool, January* 18, 1837.

"I am just returned from seeing a Unitarian minister* who lived near me laid in his grave. This is the only funeral which I have attended, during my long residence in England: but I feared there would be few present, and I wished to show this mark of respect to the deceased, as well as to my new religious connection. I could not prevent my tears falling while the coffin was let down. There is indeed much in my sensibility which is nervous; yet a mind so stored with baffled affections and regrets as mine, may be excused for its weakness. My efforts to suppress external marks of feeling are indeed very great, but not equal to the intended object. My tear, however, was not for the deceased

in the *facts* of Mr. White's change of condition, and separation from former friends. These necessities individuals cannot consistently set aside, so long as they are identified with the system called *Orthodoxy*, which limits Salvation to those who agree in certain opinions. He rejoices however to believe that, in this case, there were individuals who would forcibly have set aside every thing but the dictates of inextinguishable love for a revered friend.

* The Rev. Mr. Perry.

personally, with whom I was not at all intimate; it was for *humanity*—suffering, struggling, aspiring, daily perishing and renewed humanity. As to the grave, and the descent of the coffin, and the strange noise of the sliding ropes—these things raise no melancholy feelings within me. I know not how soon I shall be laid in that same ground—for I have desired in my will to be buried in Renshaw-Street Chapel—and the thought of my last home came vividly before me. No! it is not death that moves me; but the contemplation of the rough path, and the darkened mental atmosphere, which the human passions and interests, disguised as Religion, oblige us to tread and cross on our way to the grave. What uncharitable, nay, what barbarous feelings, under the name of *religious* fears, would the view of the good, and, I believe, long-tried man whom we committed to the ground, have raised in the bosom of many otherwise kind-hearted persons whom I know! What shock would my own presence have given to a multitude of orthodox persons, who, but for my secession from the Church, would proclaim themselves my attached friends! Is there no hope that the notion of Orthodoxy—that most deadly moral poison for the heart—shall be well subdued, if not totally conquered, in this country?"

And this was not the first time that this spirit had cast him, alone and friendless, upon the wide world,—his whole life was one continued struggle for Conscience' sake, and slow and weary was the obstructed way by which he forced himself forwards from light to light,—honoured and cherished by each Party in turn, as long as they could boast themselves of his name, or make use of his reputation, but cast out, (reluctantly indeed, and only under the necessities of system, but still cast out,) as soon as, having become familiar with the ground they occupied, he saw that it was not co-extensive with the Truth of God, and attempted to enlarge its boundaries. We use his own words in the preface to his latest work:

"Convinced that it is my duty publicly to dissent from some doctrines upon which the Orthodox seem to consider themselves as incapable of mistake, (else they would not treat those that deny them as guilty of something worse than an error of judgment,) I perceived the necessity, and submitted to the pain of quitting the domestic society of a family, whose members showed me an affection seldom bestowed but upon a near relative, and whom I love with all the tenderness and warmth of a heart which nature has not made either cold or insensible to kindness.

"It is not my intention to court the sympathy of the public on the score of what I have had to endure on this occasion. I will not complain; though this is certainly the *second time* that Orthodoxy has reduced me to the alternative of dissembling, or renouncing my best external means of happiness. But I humbly thank God, that the love of honesty and veracity which He implanted in my soul, has been strengthened, constantly and visibly, from the moment that, following its

impulse, I quitted my native country. From that time to the present—a period of five and twenty years*—every day seems to have made me more and more obedient to the principle, *not to deceive either by word or deed*. To countenance *externally* the profession of what *internally* I am convinced to be injurious to the preservation and proper spread of Christ's true Gospel, would be a conduct deserving bitter remorse and utter self-contempt."—*Heresy and Orthodoxy.*

It has been said that there is no sight on which the Divine eye rests with such full love, as that of a good man struggling with difficulties,—a true mind seeking light. We shall aim to present this spectacle as it was, with a regard for reality, which here, indeed, we are under no temptation to violate; for in this case, reality itself will require the deepest colours of the heart.

Joseph Blanco White, by birth and education, and, for a time, by earnest faith and clerical profession, was a Roman Catholic. Of Irish descent, but a Spaniard by two generations, he was born in Seville, unfortunately for him, the most bigotted and ascetic town in Spain; and there, from his tenderest years, he was subjected to that monastic discipline, that awful influence over the senses and the imagination, by which the Roman Catholic Church usurps the infant mind. The only object of his parental education was "to make him religious in their own sense of the word, and in perfect deference to the Priest who directed the conscience of the family."

"Of the excellence of my parents' hearts," he says, "of their benevolence, their sincere piety, it is impossible to speak too highly. Their misfortune and my own, as far as my happiness depended on their influence, was their implicit obedience to the system of religion in which they lived and died. In accordance with what that system established as Christian perfection, they endeavoured to bring me up consistently with the models proposed by the Church of Rome. By keeping me from the company of other children they imagined they could preserve my mind and heart from every contamination. They thus made me a solitary being during my childhood. I well recollect how I looked on the children of the poor who were playing in the streets, and envied their happiness in being allowed to associate with their equals. The theoretical part of my religious education was confined to the knowledge of the catechism, with theological explanations in the jargon of school divinity. In such explanations of mysteries I certainly became an adept for my age. The practical part consisted in a perpetual round of devotional practices, of which I still preserve the most painful recollection. I absolutely dreaded the approach of Sunday. Early in the morning of that formidable day I was made to go with my father to the Dominican Convent, where his confessor resided; afterwards we went to the Cathedral, where I had to stand or kneel for hours. Many times did I faint through exhaustion,

* Written in 1835.

but nothing could save me from a similar infliction on the succeeding Sunday. The day ended in visiting the wards of a crowded and pestilential hospital, where my father, for many years, spent two or three hours of the evening in rendering to the sick every kind of service, not excluding the most menial and revolting."

These ascetic practices produced their natural effect on a child of excessive sensibility: he was wretched, but he was a spiritual captive, helpless in the hands of his directors. At the risk of dwelling too long on these early influences, which in the mysterious providence of God did not destroy, perhaps irritated into life the seeds of the after freedom of his mind, we must add his own most instructive account of his first confession, for the sake of the light it throws on the natural elements and susceptibilities of his character.

"The effects of confession upon young minds are, generally, unfavourable to their future peace and virtue. It was to that practice I owed the first taste of remorse, while yet my soul was in a state of infant purity. My fancy had been strongly impressed with the awful conditions of the penitential law, and the word *sacrilege* had made me shudder on being told that the act of concealing any thought or action, the rightfulness of which I suspected, would make me guilty of that worst of crimes, and greatly increase my danger of everlasting torments. My parents had in this case done no more than their duty according to the rules of their Church. But though they had succeeded in raising my fear of hell, this was, on the other hand, too feeble to overcome a childish bashfulness, which made the disclosure of a harmless trifle an effort above my strength."

"The appointed day came at last when I was to wait on the confessor. Now wavering, now determined not to be guilty of sacrilege, I knelt before the priest, leaving, however, in my list of sins, the last place to the hideous offence—I believe it was a petty larceny committed on a young bird. But when I came to the dreaded point, shame and confusion fell upon me, and the accusation stuck in my throat. The imaginary guilt of this silence haunted my mind for four years, gathering horrors at every successive confession, and rising into an appalling spectre when, at the age of twelve, I was taken to receive the sacrament. In this miserable state I continued till, with the advance of reason, I plucked, at fourteen, courage enough to unburthen my conscience by a general confession of the past. And let it not be supposed that mine is a singular case, arising either from morbid feeling or the nature of my early education. Few, indeed, among the many penitents I have examined, have escaped the evils of a similar state; for what bashfulness does in children, is often in after life the immediate effect of that shame by which fallen frailty clings still to wounded virtue. The necessity of confession, seen at a distance, is lighter than a feather in the balance of desire; while at a subsequent period, it

becomes a punishment on delicacy—an instrument to blunt the moral sense, by multiplying the subjects of remorse, and directing its greatest terrors against imaginary crimes."—*Doblado's Letters*, p. 77.

There was not originally any strong impulse in his own nature leading him to become a Priest, but in a country where only the clerical profession have access to more than the elements of learning, his insatiable desire for intellectual pursuits, after a vain attempt to apply himself to commercial life, forced him into the Priesthood. Yet though by nature full of devotional sensibility, and easily brought under the dominion of mere feelings, he was not made for a Devotee, a religious slave; and even in the boy Reason disturbed the supremacy of blind Faith,—and his earliest years of preparation, with the irrevocable vows of the Priesthood in the distance, were embittered by some faint visitings of that fuller light which afterwards arose upon his soul. These doubts and disturbances he suppressed, or they were suppressed for him, by the usual contrivances of an Authoritative Religion; by ascetic practices, by voluntary efforts to reduce himself under the dominion of enthusiastic feelings, and by studiously inflaming the affections and the imagination to the extinction of the reason. For a time these artificial means prevailed; knowing nothing of Religion under any other form, reared in this hot-bed of Roman Catholicism, and stimulated by his parents in every way that could subdue an affectionate heart, he at last took the vows of a Priest.

"No language," he says, "can do justice to my own feelings at the ceremony of ordination, the performance of the first mass, and during the interval which elapsed between this fever of Enthusiasm and the cold scepticism that soon followed it. For some months previous to the awful ceremony I voluntarily secluded myself from the world, making religious reading and meditation the sole employment of my time. The *Exercises of Saint Ignatius* (ascetic practices of the most violent kind), which immediately preceded the day of ordination, filled my heart with what appeared to me a settled distaste for every worldly pleasure. When the consecrating rites had been performed—when my hands had been anointed—the sacred vesture, at first folded on my shoulders, let drop around me by the hands of the bishop—the sublime hymn to the all-creating Spirit uttered in solemn strains, and the power of restoring sinners to innocence conferred upon me—when at length raised to the dignity of a 'fellow worker with God,' the bishop addressed me in the name of the Saviour: 'Henceforth I call you not servant. . . .but I have called you friend;' I truly felt as if, freed from the material part of my being, I belonged to a higher rank of existence. . . . In vain did I exert myself to check exuberance of feelings at my first mass. My tears bedewed the *corporals* on which, with the eyes of faith, I beheld the disguised lover of

mankind whom I had drawn from heaven to my hands. There are dreams, indeed,—the illusions of an overheated fancy; but dreams they are which some of the noblest minds have dreamt through life without waking—dreams which, while passing vividly before the mental eye, must entirely wrap up the soul of every one who is neither *more* nor *less* than a man." —*Doblado's Letters*, p. 125.

"To exercise the privileges of his office for the benefit of his fellow creatures," was now the exclusive purpose of his life,—and he neglected no means that the Church appointed for keeping his mind within its power. But the crisis came at last. He has related it himself:

"When I examine the state of my mind previous to my rejecting the Christian faith, I cannot recollect any thing in it but what is in perfect accordance with that form of religion in which I was educated. I revered the Scriptures as the word of God; but was also persuaded that, without a living, infallible interpreter, the Bible was a dead letter, which could not convey its meaning with any certainty. I grounded therefore my Christian faith upon the infallibility of the Church. No Roman Catholic pretends to a better foundation. 'I believe whatever the Holy Mother Church holds and believes,' is the compendious creed of every member of the Roman Communion. Had my doubts affected any particular doctrine, I should have clung to the decisions of a Church which claims exemption from errors, but my first doubts attacked the very basis of Catholicism. I believe that the reasoning which shook my faith is not new in the vast field of theological controversy. But I protest that, if such be the case, the coincidence adds weight to the argument; for I am perfectly certain that it was the spontaneous suggestion of my own mind. I thought within myself that the certainty of the Roman Catholic faith had no better ground than a fallacy of that kind which is called reasoning in a circle; for I believed the infallibility of the Church because the Scripture said she was infallible; while I had no better proof that the Scripture said so, than the assertion of the Church, that she could not mistake the Scripture. In vain did I endeavour to evade the force of this argument; indeed I still believe it unanswerable. Was then Christianity nothing but a groundless fabric, the world supported by the elephant, the elephant standing on the tortoise? Such was the conclusion to which I was led by a system which impresses the mind with the obscurity and insufficiency of the written Word of God. Why should I consult the Scriptures? My only choice was between revelation explained by the Church of Rome, and no revelation. Catholics who live in Protestant countries may, in spite of the direct tendencies of their systems, practically perceive the unreal nature of this dilemma. But wherever the religion of Rome reigns, there is but one step between it and complete infidelity."——

"——Ten years of my life did I pass in this hot and cold fever, this ague of the heart, without a hope, without a drop of that cordial which cheers the very soul of those who sacrifice their desires to their duty under the blessed influence of Religion. . . . Ten years, the best of my life, were

passed in this insufferable state, when the approach of Buonaparte's troops to Seville enabled me to quit Spain, without exciting suspicion as to the real motive which tore me, for ever, from every thing I loved. I was too well aware of the firmness of my resolution, not to endure the most agonizing pain when I irrevocably crossed the threshold of my father's house, and when his bending figure disappeared from my eyes, at the first winding of the Guadalquiver, down which I sailed. Heaven knows that time has not had power to heal the wounds which this separation inflicted on my heart; but such was the misery of my mental slavery, that not a shadow of regret for my determination to expatriate myself has ever exasperated the evils inseparable from the violent step by which I obtained my freedom."—*Poor Man's Preservative; and Internal Evidence*, p. 9—11.

His temporary unbelief in Christianity was only the necessary result of the view, imprinted by Education, which identified Revelation with Roman Catholicism. When he came to this country he saw Christianity under other forms, not open as he conceived to the objections that were fatal to Romanism,—and his devotional tendencies, which had never deserted him, and had always sought a rest, rejoiced to be again under spiritual allegiance to Christ. What could be more natural than that the Church of England, that great opponent, in profession, to the radical errors of Popery, should receive the first acknowledgments of his reviving faith? It was not the doctrines which are considered orthodox that had made him doubt of Christianity; but the persecuting spirit of Popery, which he had supposed to be identical with Christianity,—and the theory of Church Infallibility. He did not then perceive, what he perceived afterwards, that the Church of England stood in fact upon the same foundations, though the ground is somewhat disguised,—that it regards Christianity as intended to reveal a system of doctrines, belief in which is necessary for salvation, whilst it provides no authorized Judge upon questions of faith, to make it certain that its own system of doctrines are infallibly the contents of the Revelation. As long as he believed all the principal doctrines of the Church of England, he was not led to examine this essential weakness in its foundations,—but the moment his study of the Scriptures had shaken his faith in the superstructure, he saw at once that it was an imperfect imitation of the Church of Rome, demanding, like it, the infallible Truth, but, unlike it, not providing the supposed infallible Judge. This is admirably explained by himself:

"Abhorrence of the persecuting spirit which made me renounce my native country is, perhaps, the most active sentiment of my heart. It was natural, therefore, that as soon as I became acquainted with the

most powerful antagonist which Popery had ever met, I should cling to it with my whole heart. The church of England was to me what I conceive the *Maltese* knights must have been to a Christian slave who had escaped from the prisons of Algiers into one of the Order's gallies. A long experience must have been necessary, both to myself and the subject of my illustration, to make us perceive that neither of our places of refuge was the dwelling of the full liberty we sought. But having originally examined the Church of England in its unquestionable character of a most powerful opponent of the encroachments of Rome, my eyes were too dazzled to perceive the essential defects of her constitution and the narrowness of her toleration till the (political) events of the year 1829 disabused me, not without resistance and pain on my part."—*Preface to Heresy and Orthodoxy.*

He was a convert too remarkable not to be received with distinguished favour by the Church of England. He rose into rapid celebrity,—his writings enjoyed a popularity rarely accorded to works chiefly theological,—the University of Oxford "in consideration," as it then declared, "of his eminent talents and learning, of his exemplary conduct, and of those able and well-timed publications by which he powerfully exposed the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome," conferred on him the Degree of Master of Arts by Diploma,—and if he had not made a solemn resolution, as a test of his sincerity, never to accept preferment, it is certain that the highest honours were open to him in this country, as they had previously been in Spain.

It is impossible here to trace at length the long process by which his mind came to the conclusion, that the doctrines of Orthodoxy were not scriptural. That process is recorded by himself, and will, I trust, ere long see the light. It was a conclusion that he resisted as long as with honesty he could. Influenced by his affections, and by his desire for assimilation with those he loved, he tried every means to keep himself righteously within the Church of England, as he had before tried to keep himself righteously within the Church of Rome. This struggle between his affections and the more advanced views of his mind was the source of some of the severest sufferings of his life. He was not a man to follow the cold light of the understanding, unstopped by the thought of what connections it might loosen, what sympathies it might destroy. Those only who saw him intimately could believe, with what wonderful humility so vast a mind made the attempt to conform himself to the desires of those he loved. In a life of nearly seventy years he took two steps, both of them in the same direction,—and the interval was filled up by his affections contending against the light that was forcing him away from those to whom his heart still clung. But neither was he

a man to make these attempts for ever; enough that he paid the tribute to Christian love as long as honestly he could,—as soon as the failure of all such attempts was manifest, he was prepared to take up his cross, and follow Christian Truth. The affections never were intended to make man a deceiver;—and if Christian truth requires painful separations, let those answer for it who create the necessity.

It would be an insult to his simple and unworldly nature to dwell upon so poor a thing, as heightening his sacrifice, as that from an archbishop's palace he went forth, a lonely man, to contented obscurity and neglect. That the worldly differences cost him a struggle, is a thought that will not even occur to any one who knew him. These were not the vulgar elements over which his true soul triumphed. No; it was the disturbance of friendship and affection that alone made his heart sink, and that, not so much for his own sufferings, as for the deeply-rooted and widely-spread religious evils that exact so many bleeding sacrifices. Though he never dissembled on religious subjects, yet "he could not conceal from himself that his horror of losing the affections of those whose hearts had been drawn closely to his own, had more than once enabled his feelings to disturb his judgment." And this was the noble victory he achieved over himself. We find the following entry in his private journal, when he saw that no longer could he truthfully surrender himself to these forced sympathies:

"Sincerely, though inconsiderately, and under the influence of unsuspected popish prejudices favourable to the English Establishment, did I join myself to that Church. For more than twenty years have I struggled within myself against the growing objections which, in the course of uninterrupted theological studies, I found against her doctrines. But old and infirm as I am, and strongly tempted by the affections of those with whom I live in the closest habits of friendship, not to break openly with a Church, with which they are so identified as to have lost their choice of keeping an Unitarian as an inmate—I feel it my bounden duty to show, by my sufferings, to the world, how injurious to the cause of religion, of Christian Charity and of *humanity* itself, that Church system must be, which makes such sacrifices to the *love of truth* unavoidable to me; and imposes on them *the duty* of acting towards an unoffending friend,—a friend whose promise of not attempting to proselyte they would certainly trust—with the reluctant severity which their intimate connection with the Church establishment demands. For the sake of opening the eyes of people to the evils of this kind of orthodoxy, I trust in heaven, I should have fortitude enough to go to the stake."

Two days after this record, the step is taken, and he lands an utter stranger on the quays of Liverpool, as the nearest spot

to the friends he had left, which the sense of duty permitted. Then, when the high resolve of faithful conscience had achieved the deed of Duty, the exhausted heart, no longer called to act, felt more than the bitterness of death. There is something most sad, but unspeakably noble, in the first feelings committed to his private diary in that town,—the temporary sinking of the spirit when the sacrifice was made, and the excitement of high courage no longer needed:

*Liverpool, January* 10, 1835.

"My whole life has not had moments so bitter as those which I have experienced within the last half hour. Exhausted by the inconveniences of the sea passage last night, I laid myself down and fell asleep for a short time. I awoke in that distracted state which a sudden transition from place to place frequently occasions. Now every painful circumstance of my present situation crowded upon me, so that I could not bear up against the anguish of my heart. The whole of what had passed through my mind with such irresistible power respecting my duty, appeared like a delusion—a dream, with my present misery for all its reality. In this state I had to write a few lines to those I have left, and I thought my heart would break. How entirely must I cast myself on God's mercy for support! Has not some martyr, when already bound to the stake, been tried by the awful impression that he had been brought there by a delusion? Was there not something of this horrible idea in Christ's mind, when having deliberately gone to the garden 'which Judas knew,' he thought three successive times he might possibly have overrated the necessity of drinking the cup which he had now close to his lips? Oh may his fortitude encourage me, and his spirit strengthen me! How much indeed do I want it!"

But the true spirit is never long without the encouraging sense of God's presence. Angels came to Christ in that garden. And the promise of his Father to those who love him and keep his word, was not here unfulfilled. They came to him and made their abode with him, and never afterwards left him, even for a moment. I find the following entry made the next day:

"I am relieved from that mental distress which oppressed me. All my hopes of usefulness have revived. My sense of duty is again attended with courage to perform it. My heart is full of gratitude to God the Father of my Lord Jesus Christ, for this support in my utmost need. Blessed be his name!"

The rest of his days, a period of more than six years, were spent in Liverpool, during which time his bodily weakness and ill health obliged him to lead a purely mental life, incessantly devoted to the highest departments of Thought,—rejoicing, whenever an interval of strength permitted, in his mental freedom, and in the firmer faith into which his soul rose, when his reason

was relieved from the difficulties that had so long clouded his views of God and Christ.

In his private journal there is the following entry, on August 17, 1835:

"At no period of my life have I enjoyed moments of purer happiness than during the present. As soon as that agitating struggle ——— was at an end, I began to reap the reward of my determination. I am of course subject to attacks of that dejecting and distracting indigestion which has the power to cast a veil of darkness over nature. But I have learnt to distinguish between reality and this peculiar delusion. I wait till the cloud has glided off, and am all the while certain that sunshine is behind it. But never before had I perceived what happiness may be bestowed on man, through the mere activity of his soul. I had to-day relieved the uneasiness and pain to which I am subject; had dressed myself, and, as has been my custom for some time past, had opened my window and seated myself in view of the heavens, to collect my mind for the daily tribute of adoration to my Maker. The mere act of directing my mind to Him, in the presence of his glorious works, filled me with an inexpressible, though tranquil and rational delight. I said to myself—What a glorious gift conscious existence is in itself! Heaven must essentially consist in the absence of whatever disturbs the quiet enjoyment of that consciousness, in the intimate conviction of the presence of God."

He has recorded the fact that from the time of his acting upon his last convictions, his living faith in God and Christ, and his consolations in Religion, were daily gaining strength. He had never been in any dissenting place of worship, and having been always told that he could never bear the coarseness of other dissenters, and the absence of all real devotion with Unitarians, he was for a time 'afraid that he should be obliged to follow Milton's example, and abstain from public worship.' He came, however, and saw for himself; and for the sake of those in the Church (of whom he thought there were many) who may suppress their doubts by the question, "but where shall we go?" his experience ought to be made known. These are his words:

"Oh that it were possible that some of my friends would 'come and see;' how much their unjust prejudices would be softened. The Unitarian worship stands on ground which all Christians hold as sacred. What strikes me most of all is, the *reality*, the true connection with life which this worship possesses. All that I had practised before, seemed to be in a region scarcely within view. It was something which I forced myself to go through because I had persuaded myself that it would be good for the soul; yet like an unintelligible and partly revolting charm, it only fatigued, but did not touch the mind, except here and there when the prayer descended from the clouds of theology, and did not adopt the slavish language of eastern devotion. But here the whole worship is a

part of my real life. 'I pray with my spirit; I pray with my understanding also.' May I not say that suffering every hour from the bleeding wounds of my heart, those wounds that even my friends touch roughly —I have been already rewarded for acting in conformity with principle? I believe my faith in Christ is stronger—it has more *reality*—it is more a part of my being—not detached, loose, an appendage, hanging on, and almost in the way of real life—but, like an articulated limb, adding strength to the whole of my moral being."

He had the strongest sense of the importance of social worship as the purest means of keeping alive in the heart spiritual sentiments of God and of humanity; and, whenever his great bodily sufferings permitted, he never omitted an opportunity of seeking these connections with his fellow men. Not many weeks before his death he sent for the writer of these notices, early on Sunday morning, and having for days together suffered anguish which cannot be described, he said with tears, which he was too feeble to restrain,—"I wish you to ask for me the prayers of your congregation,—I do not doubt the goodness of my God,—nor do I believe that he overlooks me, or requires intercession,—but my soul longs for religious sympathy,—and I wish to feel that I am not separated from my fellow Christians, nor deprived of the consolations I have always found from social prayer."

The last result of his religious inquiries was the firmest faith in the *spirit* of Christianity as the divine guide and light of men, together with the absolute rejection of every thing of a dogmatic or external nature, as essential to the salvation of the soul. And the only correction required to be passed on his latest published writings to bring them into more entire conformity with his last views of Religion, would be to strike out traces of a conventional language, clinging to him from former habits, which seemed to recognize other essentials of Christianity than the true allegiance of the soul to the spirit of the Christ. He had no toleration for the theological habit of setting snares for faith,—and Christianity was to him the Religion of life,—the acceptance by the heart and soul of the moral and spiritual Christ, *independently of all dogmas whatsoever*. He regarded as decidedly opposed to the direct purpose of the Christian mission, the common view that *any* speculative views are necessary to Salvation. Many of his latest religious connection will differ from him in his views of the essence of Christianity, but he revolted from all Orthodoxies, wherever they might appear, and having emancipated himself from older and more imposing authorities, he was not likely to yield himself up to Unitarian Standards. Never was there a heart more full of moral love for

Christ. Never was there a Disciple who more truly understood that Master.

He may justly be regarded as the most distinguished convert Unitarianism ever had, a convert all the more honoured for the consistency with which he has taken successive steps in the direction of the same fundamental principles;—but we should very much mistake him if we deemed him one of a class, or that the word Unitarianism, as expressive of a sect, exactly describes and compasses his mind. He had taken up Unitarian views from a new position, and therefore we should expect him to carry into them new lights. In truth, it may be signally useful to observe what modification our views undergo when taken up by minds trained in other Schools, and removed from some of our narrowing and partial influences. We are all in danger of exclusiveness,—of the bigotry of maintaining that a subject has no sides, no points of view, except those our little experience has presented to ourselves. We think too much in masses. There is too little of individual investigation, and individual opinion. With most men, to determine what sect they belong to, gives you their whole confession of faith. When you know that they are Churchmen, or Independents, or Baptists, or Unitarians, you know all that is to be known about them. There is nothing to distinguish the individual from the class. Thus every little party lives within its own set of influences, and there is nothing to lead them to a new point of view. We ought to be alive therefore, with the expectation of new light, whenever a fresh mind looks upon our work from the vantage ground of another position than our own. Certainly our views can be perfected only by taking them from every side; and since that is impossible to any of us singly, each individual must be invited to throw his own experience into the common stock of Truth, and out of the whole the view may be completed. We reverence Mr. White's progressive spirit too much, to claim him as a partizan. Would to God that his Catholic mind was claimed, as it ought to be, by the whole Church of Christ!

He had the most real and constantly operative belief in a guiding and protecting Providence, who cares for the individual, and shapes the course of events so as to fall in with the improvement or the happiness of those who seek the leadings of His Spirit. And this faith in a God intimately present to the individual is especially deserving of mention in a mind of so philosophical a character, and that would have revolted from the gross human conceptions of special interferences. He derived this belief in a Providence never absent from the individual, and

which was the source to him of unfailing consolation, from the spiritual faith of Christ, that God was a Spirit, and that the soul which sought Him was ever the sanctuary of the Deity. The last words he was heard to utter on the subject of Providence, a few nights before his death, were these,—"that whatever might be the difficulties in the course of this our life, yet in the very direction of those difficulties there were circumstances that were more than compensations for any sufferings that Duty and Principle might bring,—and that though he had never doubted of Providence, he had seen this in his own case more clearly than any Treatise had ever presented it to him." He had not much patience with those philosophical pretensions that aspired to clear the subject of Providence of all mysteries. To comprehend, in this full measure, the ways of God he thought was nothing less than an attempt to define the infinite, to know the Omniscient. He was in the habit of saying, "Man must turn to the light within him, aided by its developments in Christ,—the highest, the purest, the best guide he knows. He must follow that light; he must sacrifice his selfish will to the duties which *Conscience* points out, and, forgetting the dark mystery of his existence, *use* that existence, so that if it depended upon him exclusively, the universe would be free from evil. Any conduct but this is madness." He believed that the material views of God which exist in the common mind were the greatest obstructions to true Religion, and the real supports of prevailing systems. He nourished his own soul on the sublime words of Christ to the woman of Samaria: "God is a Spirit: and they who worship Him must worship in Spirit and in Truth." This was his view of the spiritual God:

"Whenever the ideas of wisdom, order, love, blend together into an imageless conception, and that conception draws the soul into the Infinite, in an act of longing love after the eternal source of our being, how pure, how tranquil, how confident is the adoration which the soul performs! Tears indeed suffuse the eyes—for the longing itself reminds us of a state of suffering, of evil, and of struggle; but the mind turns back to the business and the pains of life full of filial confidence, without a thought about acts of propitiation, about practical measures of safety against the wrath of the Idol-God of the multitude. It feels assured that *life* itself under a conscientious faithfulness to Reason, is the only acceptable service which the true, the spiritual God expects from his creatures. This is true Faith."

For a time, after his arrival in Liverpool, he was supported by the first feelings of complete mental freedom, and by the thought that, by his continued writings on Religion, he might be useful

to mankind,—but when increasing languor and pain took this hope from him, and nothing was left but a life of solitary meditation, an earnest desire for death came upon him,—to be taken away from this world, in which his part was finished. He had no fear of death. He had no fear of any thing that was of God's ordaining. And yet he did not approve of those definite views of the precise nature of the future existence which some regard as the only source of effectual support. He thought that this partook of a material enthusiasm, and proceeded from a want of perfect Trust. His feeling was, that he could trust a friend though he knew not exactly where he was leading him, and that if so, he could have no fears with his God. At the commencement of the last crisis of his illness, when his own impression was that he would not survive the day, he spoke almost in these words his latest convictions of Religion:

"In the midst of my suffering, all *the leading thoughts* are present with me. I am weak, and therefore my *feelings* overpower me. I have contributed my mite to the Liberty of mankind. It is cast into God's treasury. I stand upon a rock. God's providence is carried on by the struggles of Reason against the passions. I have no doubts. I came from God, and I go to Him. There must be an infinite source of the rationality which we know to be in us, and who will receive us to Himself."

For nearly three months he may be said to have been in a dying state, through sufferings which even those who witnessed could but faintly know; and with a patience whose amount God alone can compute. An idea of the weakness, of the condition of absolute dependence to which he was reduced, is faithfully conveyed in the words of one of his friends, "that even the tear which the expression of sympathy, or the heart's silent prayer drew from him, had to be wiped away by the hand of another." This image, properly taken from the higher forms of life, will picture the helplessness that cannot be described. To the necessities of such a condition he submitted himself with the gentleness, the humility of a child,—but it was with the dignity of a child of God, who can receive no degradation from his Father's hands. With something of the unassailable greatness of Christ, when struck by a rude hand, he endured, as coming from God, with perfect simplicity, what without that feeling would have been humiliation worse than death. His filial faith was that singleness of vision which makes the whole being full of light. It was in fact the eye of his soul,—he had no other way of looking upon life. It seemed to belong to the very essence of his being, and not to be liable to the disturbances that proceed from the instabilities of feeling. And all pain, all sorrow, has but a passing time,—whilst where there is a spirit

living and shining through them, the resulting fruits of instruction, the weight of glory, remain and are eternal. The suffering, the long probation, was one of the things that are *seen and are temporal*; himself, the noble spirit, is with *the unseen and eternal.* The long watch is closed. The chamber of death, which his presence made a spiritual temple, is silent now; and "the light which was with us for a while" is withdrawn into the Heavens. Among the last words that he had strength distinctly to utter were: "God to me is Jesus, and Jesus is God,—of course not in the sense of Divines." "When the hour shall come my soul will be concentrated in the feeling, 'My God, into thy hands I commend my spirit.'" A few hours before death, to the friend who was watching by him in the early morning, he said with a firm voice, "Now I die." The long struggle ended so peacefully that the moment of death was not apparent. He died on the 20th of May, at Greenbank, near Liverpool, in the house of Mr. Rathbone.

We have not spoken of his writings; of his vast intellectual power; of his ripe knowledge; of his imagination so bold and easy, yet ever so instructive and wonderfully true; nor of his extraordinary command, the most perfect ever acquired by a foreigner, over all the resources of our language; these will manifest themselves; we have preferred to speak of what were the daily sources of his mental life and peace,—of his affections,—of his noble simplicity,—of the infinite value he attached to that sympathy which the world cannot buy,—of his views of man's discipline,—of his childlike rest on God.

That the struggle between his affections for those who could not retain him in communion, and his yet higher love for the God of Truth and Light, was the source of his chief mental sufferings, and indeed the key to the character of his mind, is apparent even from his very latest writings. The following truly sublime prayer is one of his last compositions:

"Oh thou great Being, who from the dawn of my reason, didst reveal thyself within my heart, to Thee I may venture to speak humbly but freely, in the sanctuary of my soul. It is *there* that I obtain the nearest approach to Thee: there alone I know Thee face to face, not in the figure of a man, not in the coloured shadows of imagination, but in the truly spiritual character of Knowledge, Power, Will, Consciousness. Thou hast identified me with Thee; and yet infinitude lies between us. Thus mysteriously united and distinct, a mere thought undraws the spiritual veil of the oracle to which Thou hast consecrated me a Priest; I am instantly conscious of thy presence. No fire or thunder, no smoke weltering in the flames, no sound of the trumpet from the summit of a blazing mountain, can so surely attest that nearness. Thy 'still small voice' pene-

trates my very essence, and I reverence Thee from the mysterious centre where my Being and my Nothingness unite. How great, how little I am! less than dust and ashes; nobler than the morning star by my powers of Thought,—though not a breath of life is properly my own, yet I can confidently pour the workings of my heart into thy infinite bosom; nay, those spiritual workings which I call mine seem to proceed from Thee. What! if in passing through me they become subject to obscurity and distortion? I will every moment refer them back to the eternal, immutable light which is their source, and much of the distortion will cease.

"Nor shall I be deterred because other men tell me that these very thoughts are grievous offences in thy sight. To exert my mind under a vehement desire that my thoughts may conform with Thine, is the only form of worship in my power not unworthy of Thee. Eternal Spirit! I am thy child: to trace and to increase in myself a likeness to my Father, is bliss unspeakable. This is what I would purchase with ten thousand lives: this is that which I have but one way to accomplish: a way which Thou didst show to one, who in spite of many imperfections did ardently love Thee, and was frequently taught by Thee: I must, 'with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, be changed into the same image from glory to glory, as from the Spirit of the Lord.' Strange! that I am invited to approach thy glory with open face, and yet my fellow creatures would abash me when I frankly manifest my thoughts to them! Oh! there are spots on this earth, on which were I to declare to men what I do not endeavour to disguise before Thee, my life would fall a sacrifice to their indignation. Alas! this weight of misery which crushes me while I am slowly and painfully recording the thoughts I now address directly to Thee, what is it but the result of the treatment I have received from my fellow-Christians, my fellow-countrymen, my own flesh, my dear friends? They thought Thee too remiss in avenging my freedom. Let them however be zealous for Thee in the manner most opposed to Thy dealings with me. Thy internal blessings (may I not say external too?) have been multiplied in proportion as I have gained confidence to let my soul appear before Thee, without attempting to disguise myself from myself; in proportion as I became *practically* convinced that a *lie* can under no circumstances be agreeable to Thee: that man cannot serve Thee with a *lie*. What I do at this moment is the natural and unsought-for result of the growth of my reverential openness towards Thee. It is delightful to open my heart before Thee, oh Eternal Being. Men will not bear to hear me; a very few who may have undergone the fiery preparation through which I have passed, may fearfully listen; and for those I record my meditations. But the madness of the mass of zealots is such, that they will not bear another man to differ from them. Their pride is fired up at such boldness. 'Think like myself—or I will make you suffer to the whole extent of my power.' In spite, oh God, of thy visible conduct, in spite of that divine forbearance with which thou treatest them when they most differ from thy best known attributes, they proclaim to the world that Thou art the most jealous and intolerant of Beings: that thou wouldst turn thy hot anger against every one who doth not punish those within his reach,

whom he chooses to call thine enemy. I shall be to them a blasphemer. Ah! who blasphemes but he who calls Thee (oh fountain of Goodness!) jealous? No, Father! Thou wilt not be jealous of such a worm as Man. Thou wouldst not be jealous if there existed a Lucifer, Son of the Morning, to be something like a rival to Thee! Thy goodness would conquer him by Love."

One word more is due, not indeed to man but, to God who knoweth the heart. Neither our veneration, nor our love, must make us forget the perfection that God requires. The best men, especially, must be tried by those holy standards to which their very virtues show their own humanity might aspire. If, then, in that noble life, there were any of the errors of our human frailty,—though they left no stains upon the soul, though they had their source in no evil feeling, though their traces could not be found,—yet for erring man we claim no perfection except such as contrition and humility of soul may give,—and whilst we bless our God for the goodness and greatness which we felt and knew, we leave it to Omniscient Mercy to reckon the deductions.

We rejoice to say there are memoirs, and materials of biography, in which many noble truths are worthily inscribed, and from which many an instructive lesson may be gathered. These indeed will ill supply the living light which is extinguished amongst us. A standard-bearer is fallen in our Israel; and the wisest, the noblest, the tenderest mind amongst us, is with us no more. How poor seems now the love we paid him! How strange seems now our neglect to feed our lamps at that full light! But lately, and the amplest knowledge, the kindest and mightiest aids that one mind can give another, were within the reach of any one of us, and now the opportunity is gone, and we are left to ourselves. Will the morning never reach our hearts: "Yet a little while and the light is with you: walk while ye have the light, lest the darkness come upon you."

Mr. White was interred on Monday the twenty-fourth of May, in the burying ground attached to Renshaw-Street Chapel, Liverpool.*

The following Address was delivered, on the occasion, by the Rev. James Martineau.

### *Funeral Address.*

It is finished. Another term of probation has expired. Behold, a mortal rests; a friend is gone; a spirit retires behind

* It is in contemplation to erect in the Chapel a Monument of Mr. White,—the character of which must, of course, be determined by the means procurable. Those who feel interested in this design, are requested to signify their desire of co-operation.

the veil; the lonely takes his shelter within the upper family of God. How still and peaceful is this moment, when the long struggle of life resigns its victim, and that deserted frame lies there in silent answer to the sufferer's prayer, "O Lord, how long?" The throb of pain is felt no more; the weight of weariness is lifted off; the tension of the tortured will is quite relaxed: and of this we will speak with thanksgiving, though else it were sad that the patient light of those looks is quenched, and the accents of that venerable voice have ceased. Not often indeed can the grave bereave the world of such a priceless treasure as this: no common soul dwelt within that lifeless form: a vast knowledge, a rare wisdom, a rich experience, a devout trust, are plunged into the unfathomable night, and hidden from our eyes: yet, here is death a thing divine,—"a secret place of the Most High," full of mildest protection;—a cool "shadow of the Almighty" to the fevered and afflicted mind. Physical anguish extorts from us here a confession, true also in a sublime moral sense, that it is more awful to live than to die. How, indeed, can we stand here, in the presence of that poor dust,—how perceive the fresh light and breath of morning, and the stir of labour, and the looks of living men, and all the eddies of our life-stream, flowing and whirling around it in vain, without owning that *to be* is deeper and more solemn than *not to be;* to be awake with our Freewill, than to sleep beneath Necessity; to be ordered on to this mighty theatre of wonder and of duty, than to be summoned from it, where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest. Ours truly is the fearful lot, to whom remains the unfinished race, the untouched burthen, the yet fierce temptations of life,—its ambushed conflicts, and its doubtful victory. On us too, as on the faithful who have gone before, may God have pity in our day; and number us with those whose peace is sealed, whose rest is sure!

Meanwhile, it is a weighty moment, when we bid adieu to a mind like that which now waves to us the mortal farewell. But for the dear prisoner himself, emancipated now, we might begrudge that higher world, rich already with the accumulated spoils of earth, this new treasure from our sphere, where such spirits are all too few; and complain of that law of spiritual attraction, by which holy things gather themselves together in this universe of God:—so that to them who have much, yet more is given, and from those who have little is taken away even that which they have. For in the fall of this life, it is not any solitary mourner, not any domestic group, not any province or any sect,—but an era of the church and the world, one of whose lights is extinguished, one of whose choice spiritual forces is spent. We part from one who has not simply *passed through* his

allotted portion of time; but who has truly *lived;* sharing its most vivid existence, and in contact with its most brilliant points, and himself impressing a new form on some of its highest interests; who had gathered most of its wisdom, and experienced all its severities; who consecrated himself to the pure service of truth, and the untiring quest of the living God, with the singleness of a great purpose, and the dignity of a high faith; and in his fidelity to this vow, passed from exile to honour, and from honour back into neglect, with the courage of a martyr, and the simplicity of Christ. His part is over; his work remains. The meditations of wisdom, and the sanctities of conscience cannot perish under the providence of God; and he has left us many a deep and sacred thought,—many an image from his own true soul,—for which the world will be happier yet, and the pure light of devout and Christian reason, wherein he lived, open over us a deeper heaven than the storm-clouds of fear and superstition now permit us to behold. While the labours of his mind still survive, to share the noble strife through which all things great and good must pass to their triumph in this world, he is gone where no error can mislead, no falsehood prevail, no tempest of deluded passion beat upon the good.

Our departed friend here lays down a life of *thought* and *suffering* rather than of *action.* Such a life we instinctively conceive to be in spiritual sympathy with heaven; and the belief attests the natural feeling of all men, that the inward spirit has a divine ascendancy over the outward forms of existence. We part from one who dwelt indeed within our days, but was not limited to their range; who had collected the thoughts of every age, and lived in communion with all generations of the wise. Belonging to no time, he comes before our conceptions as ripe for eternity:—the wisdom from above does but return home, when it goes thither. He has but joined the great and holy with whom he has long been familiar, and entered the mild converse with immortals, long studied in exile here. He is gone to that Messiah whose mind he so well understood, and so simply obeyed; gone to the closer embrace of that Infinite Spirit, within whose Fatherhood he reposed like a suffering and trustful child. And though his mortal remains rest not in the tombs of his fathers, but in a foreign clime; yet all lands are near alike to heaven, and the pure spirit is nowhere alien in the universe of God. Let us then consign these relics with faith and reverence to the earth; in hope to meet their departed spirit, when we shall have crossed the gulf of silence, and reached the sphere where doubts shall be resolved, and the mystic secret opened, and the tears of mortal grief for ever wiped away.

## SONNET.

By Joseph Blanco White.

*Night and Death.*

Mysterious Night! when our first Parent knew
Thee, from Report divine, and heard thy Name,
Did he not tremble for this lovely Frame,
This glorious Canopy of Light and Blue?

Yet 'neath a Curtain of translucent Dew,
Bathed in the rays of the great setting Flame,
Hesperus with the Host of Heaven came,
And lo! Creation widened in Man's view.

Who could have thought such Darkness lay concealed
Within thy beams, oh Sun! or who could find,
Whilst Fly, and Leaf, and Insect stood revealed,
That to such Countless Orbs thou mad'st us blind!
Why do we, then, shun Death with anxious Strife?
If Light can thus deceive, wherefore not Life?

## Art. III.—THE SPIRIT OF PAUL'S CHRISTIANITY EXTRACTED FROM ITS DOCTRINAL FORMS.

Spiritus intus alit.—Virg.

There are probably few reflecting persons at the present day, who would not, if they were quite sincere, acknowledge themselves to be frequently embarrassed by doubts and difficulties on the most interesting and momentous subjects of human thought and inquiry. Could they speak out their minds, and share their perplexities with others who may be secretly experiencing the same uneasiness—they would at once be relieved, and open-hearted conference might work out a practical result of satisfaction and peace. But the terror of public opinion is held out against all such indiscreet revelations; the inward misery of the soul must be nursed in secret; and the prohibition to be strictly honest cherishes the worst and most consuming scepticism.

It is a great misfortune in the present constitution of English society, that every man, unless he is content to become a mere cypher in existence, is almost compelled to attach himself to some sect or party, marked off by a sharp and definite limit from the rest of the community—and that so little neutral ground is left him, which he would gladly occupy as a free searcher after truth, anxious to maintain a friendly and candid intercourse with all the various associations of his fellow-men, but bound, in the actual state of his opinions, to identify himself absolutely with none. The consequence is, that men are forced to a premature fixation of their views; and that questions of speculative difficulty, which still continue to rankle in the depths of the mind, are abruptly foreclosed, before any opportunity is afforded of bringing them to a satisfactory termination.

Our earliest imbibed feelings and sentiments, which have become a part of our moral nature, and which contribute so essentially to the comfort and right ordering of our existence—and the convictions which reason obtrudes upon us—seem oftentimes painfully at variance. We do not doubt, they may be reconciled; and we can even fancy we discern the way; but public opinion fulminates its intolerant protest against the only course by which the reconciliation might be effected.

How many a man, for example, is in this situation! The character of Christ and the spirit of his religion—its transforming influence on civilization—its ever-spreading agency—its effect on the hearts and consciences of those who sincerely imbibe it—

carry with them completely not only the sympathy of the moral feelings, but the approval of the reason and the inward sense of an overruling providence. On the other hand, the difficulties of the Scripture, the apparent disagreement of some of its statements with the established truths of science and the known laws of nature, the uncertain and fluctuating principles applied to its interpretation, the opposite doctrinal systems deduced from it by different sects who equally claim for their own its express sanction and authority, and the irreconcileable hostility of theologians of different schools—excite doubt, perplexity and hesitation, from which, in the usual way of viewing these subjects, it is impossible for the candid and truthful mind wholly to free itself.

Is a man who experiences these embarrassments necessarily reduced to one of two alternatives? Must he embrace the cold negations of Deism with which he has no sympathy, and forego the genial, cheering influences of Christian communion? or must he, retaining his Christianity, be responsible for all the inconsistencies which a rigid doctrinal construction of its letter entails?—This is the question at issue. All good men acknowledge the benignant power of Christianity on the heart and life; but what Christianity is essentially, as distinct from the dogmatic forms in which we see it everywhere embodied—and how we must evolve its spirit by a self-consistent principle of interpretation from the written record—it is not so easy to determine. This is the great problem which theology has henceforth to solve; and its satisfactory solution, we may without any undue confidence predict, will open a new era of Christianity, bringing its great principles into closer union with the present wants and tendencies of society, and not inferior, in the extent and importance of the change it must introduce, to the Reformation itself. In the eye of those who look a little below the surface of things—there are already not a few indications of a general movement in this direction. In all sects and parties we find individuals dissatisfied with what exists, and convinced that things cannot remain where they are; searching after a central truth which lies somewhere in the midst of them; quitting a dogmatic for an eclectic spirit; and preparing for the adoption of a genuine catholicity of principle, by freely accepting the elements of truth and good wherever they are found.—If we are not mistaken, the way towards this new construction of Christianity—if we may so without presumption call it—must be found in a clearer conception than seems yet to prevail, of the distinction between the *form* and the *spirit* of a religion. We dislike the use of such technical terms, could

they be avoided; but if we can once seize the idea which they express, they will conveniently serve as the signs of a distinction, which it is very important to keep in mind.

Feelings and tendencies exist in the depths of the mind, which do not shape themselves into any very distinct ideas, but which have nevertheless the strongest influence on action and happiness, and clothe with a peculiar character the life of an individual.—Such tendencies appear to belong to the original organization of the mind. When peculiarly marked and decisive, they constitute what may be not unaptly called the instinct of genius; and, when less powerfully developed, still furnish the latent distinctions of character among men, forming their habitual associations of ideas, and secretly impelling their course of action. Of this nature are all the feelings and tendencies which relate to the infinite and the spiritual: these are at once the strongest in their influence, and the most indistinct in their object, of any we experience. No ideas that we can form, adequately embrace the great eternal truths to which we are still conscious all such feelings and tendencies must relate; no language can convey any conception of the power which accompanies them; and any attempt to realize them must be figurative and symbolical—a remote approximation—assuming its form from the character and condition of the conceiving mind.

Religion then, in its simple essence, as distinct from morality and metaphysics, is a feeling—a sentiment—the consciousness that we live in the presence of a Supreme Power, that all we have proceeds from him—that our moral life has an indissoluble connection with him independent of all the changes of a material existence, and that in the progress of moral development we attain to a more intimate communion with him.—This is the spirit of Theism in its most general sense.

Even in positive religions, such as Judaism, Parsism, Mohammedanism and Christianity, we may discern a spirit distinct from the forms in which they are expressed; in other words, we may perceive the feelings and tendencies which they most powerfully call into exercise, apart from the dogmas or intellectual conceptions and the outward acts of worship, in which they are realized and embodied.—Of all positive religions, Christianity in its earliest annunciation was the most independent of outward forms. It came to the heart of man, like a spirit and a power; and breathed a re-animating influence over society. One Father, supreme in power and in glory—one messenger of grace and truth from him, the exemplar of human duty and the perfection of human virtue—men's filial relation to God, and their fraternal relation to each other and to Christ—union with

God through faith, and the surrender of the will and affections to him—a futurity of blessedness as the reward of patient and victorious virtue;—this is its spirit—these are its essential principles—these are the considerations and views which lead to its peculiar effects, and produce the distinguishing features of the Christian character. If we abstract the doctrines and usages peculiar to different sects—this is what remains as common to them all, though sometimes obscured and enfeebled by the extraneous matter associated with it. It is the excellence of pure Christianity, that it has arrested in the simplest and most intelligible form the general spirit of Theism on those great and unchanging relations, which embrace all the conceivable conditions in which human beings can be placed—their moral relation to God, their moral relation to each other, the moral relation of time to eternity—and has embodied and exemplified these great principles in the living and dying of a faultless specimen of humanity.

This then is the spirit of Christianity, adapted to the immutable relations of man and God; and the perfection of Christ's character arises from his distinct consciousness of those relations, and his acting and feeling in entire consistency with them. But Christ stands above our ordinary humanity, in intimate union with God; and the principles which he revealed in his teachings and his life—to be reduced to practice—must pass through a tempering medium, and be adjusted to the conception and capacity of inferior natures. Hence the changing forms in which the spirit has expressed itself. For our intellectual nature is progressive, and the conceptions which it forms of all objects change with its own development. Thus, while the moral relations which the spirit of Christianity embraces are in themselves eternally the same—the mode in which men render those relations intelligible to their minds, and clothe them with the hues of their own feelings and imaginations, is continually varying. It is obviously desirable that there should be a harmony between the forms in which the most important moral relations are conceived and the general state of intellectual advancement on other subjects. It is very unfortunate, when these forms have been so rigidly fixed as to be incapable of expansion with the general growth of the understanding. For the same forms which may have been appropriate and unavoidable in one age, become useless and even pernicious in another.

It may seem a startling position, but it is confirmed by the whole history of human society—that errors and prejudices, as they are afterwards found, are in their time and place necessary and beneficial instruments in the hand of Providence for ac-

celerating the progress of civilization and preparing the way for the reception of the greatest truths. We are too much in the habit of applying our own standard of things, which will itself be abandoned in time by our more enlightened descendants, to states of manners and opinion wholly different from that in which we live. Great injustice is thus often done to past ages; and invincible difficulties are gratuitously heaped on Christianity —by assuming, that because it comes ultimately from God, it can escape the universal laws of human development—and by retaining beyond their time the forms, which belonged to its infancy, but now only encumber and depress the free unfolding of its spirit. Prejudice (by which term we here understand limited and partial views) is often the only practicable vehicle for the earliest communication of truth. Prejudice itself we must not retain one moment after we perceive that it is prejudice; but we must carefully cherish the truth which God has commissioned it to bring to us, and which we shall now extricate more clear and bright, after separating the ore in which it was encrusted. It is difficult, no doubt, to make the separation, though the distinction really exists. Thoughtfulness, self-culture, and an attention to the practical effects of religion without respect to sectarian predilections—furnish the best means of distinguishing between the transient error and the permanent truth—the varying form and the immutable spirit.

We shall now proceed to apply these principles to the doctrinal system of the apostle Paul—endeavouring to discover through the conceptions immediately presented to the mind, the positive result of truth which has been thus introduced into the world. We shall take his most important doctrines in succession.

(1.) He teaches very distinctly, that God is the author of all things, and absolutely omnipotent; and at the same time that man deserves condemnation for the sin that he has committed. These positions drawn into their consequences, as conceived by us, seem to involve a metaphysical and a moral incongruity; and their true relation to each other cannot be apprehended by the mind of man, in its present state of advancement. If God be strictly the universal cause, the remote sources of sin itself must be traced back to him; and to suppose that he could subject a creature to suffering, not leading to a good beyond itself, and otherwise unattainable—for the unavoidable consequences of a system, which he had himself devised—must obviously involve an impeachment of his moral attributes. Yet both doctrines express convictions which seem to arise spontaneously in the mind, and are perhaps faint anticipations of

some great truth which we are at present unable to grasp.—The spirit of the practical inference which they deposit in the mind, is this; that God must ever remain in this life the unsearchable object of human reverence and awe, and that man must use his free agency for the pursuit of truth and right.

(2.) Paul speaks of Christ as the image of the invisible God, the first-born of the creation, in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the divine power bodily, the Lord of all things in heaven and earth, raised above all principality and power, all things put under his feet. The conception in the apostle's mind seems to have been, that Christ was the archetypal man—the head of the spiritual creation. This was the form of his conception of Christ; and it has been succeeded by other forms in other ages—Athanasianism, Sabellianism, Arianism, and, as a negation of other forms, simple Humanitarianism. But what may we regard as the lasting truth, involved in all these forms? That Christ is the ideal of humanity in its state of ultimate perfection and complete union with God—the model to which we must unceasingly strive to conform ourselves—our medium of access to God—the more we resemble whom the more we become one with God. If we retain this view of Christ, we possess the spirit of the apostle's doctrine; all else is form, changing with the age, the country, or the individual.

(3.) We have the doctrine of justification by faith. Now, what is this doctrine? Not the worthlessness of morality—the vulgar Antinomianism of fanatics—this is a gross and dangerous error; not simply the inefficacy of the ceremonial works of the law—this was a doctrine of the time—the particular form of a general principle suggested by the apostle's own circumstances:—but the universal truth involved is this—that we must live in faith and act from conviction; that true virtue cannot be inspired by fear, commanded by authority, or secured by calculation, but that it must come from a heart filled with kind and pure affections, and governed by a calm and honest reason.

(4.) Atonement or reconciliation through Christ, "whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood." (Rom. iii. 25.) This is the form of the apostle's conception. Must we abide by that form? or can we pass through it to a deeper and holier truth, of which it has served merely as the vehicle and the introduction? The idea of atonement, propitiation, satisfaction, is inconsistent with that of free mercy, which is equally ascribed by Paul to God. It does not accord with our notion of a Father, that he should be induced to remit the punishment due to any portion of his human family, in con-

sideration of another's sufferings, gratuitously incurred. It gives to suffering for itself a sort of abstract value in the sight of God. Such conduct in a human father, tried by the general spirit of the Christian morality, would certainly not enhance our esteem for his character. The notion is altogether *anthropomorphitic*, and derived from that principle of retaliation which pervaded all the earliest systems of retributive justice—an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth—and which, governing the relations of human society, was transferred to the relations supposed to subsist between God and his creatures. These sacrificial and propitiatory notions were so deeply blended with the earliest religions of the world, and entered so essentially into every conception of the relations between God and man—that they could be expelled, and juster views substituted in their place—only by a sort of moral *homœopathy*—by the exhibition of a conception which gathered, as it were, their collective influence into itself, and exhausted their power in one final effort—by holding up Christ's death as the one all-sufficient sacrifice, by which he made atonement once for all, and opened a free passage for all men to the throne of God. This was the form in which a great truth could in that age be brought home most cogently and impressively to the minds of men. And what was that truth?—the free access to God, without priest or sacrifice, through simple penitence and faith—of all human beings who turn to him with a truly childlike heart and a sincere purpose of obedience. This quick and vigorous idea, once implanted in the heart, ultimately expelled by the power of its own vitality the grosser elements originally associated with it; and in its progress towards that final result, it has contributed in the successive adaptations of its forms to the wants and capacities of various states of individual character and social condition, to strengthen the love of God and the hatred of sin, and to encourage spirituality of mind.

(5.) It was the doctrine of the apostle, that believers only could be saved. This was his conception of the salvation that is in Christ. Not looking beyond the circumstances in which he was immediately called to act—his sincere and earnest mind saw in Christianity the only means of deliverance from sin; the means and the end were one in his view; and the exclusion of unbelievers from the hope of salvation was only a form of the indisputable truth, that sin is an effectual bar to the favour and acceptance of God. But the retention of the form has furnished a pretext in later ages for the worst intolerance. The real truth involved is this; that a religious spirit is essential to the highest virtue and happiness—that in this sense believers only can at-

tain to salvation; but all who turn to God, and seek the right and the true with singleness of heart, and sincerely follow the light that is afforded them, must be comprehended in the definition of believers.

(6.) Paul's doctrine of Christ's descending from heaven to raise the dead and to judge the world appears to us to furnish a sort of touchstone of the principle we have been advocating—and to prove beyond a question the necessity of distinguishing between the form and the spirit of a doctrine. Paul certainly believed and taught, that the future age was near at hand, though he disclaims a knowledge of the precise time of its commencement,—and that those who were living with himself upon the earth would be caught up with the risen dead, to meet their descending Lord in the air, and to share the glory and felicity of his Messianic reign. From these conceptions, implicitly embraced in their primitive form, was derived the *Chiliasm* or belief of Christ's reign of a thousand years on earth—which was so prevalent among the early Christians, and which some of the Fathers, as Papias, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus, did not hesitate to adopt. It would seem, that the expectation was only worn out by degrees through repeated disappointments. This was made a subject of ridicule with unbelievers. Peter (2 Ep. iii. 4) speaks of scoffers who asked, "Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." From time to time this expectation has again sprung up in the Church—the form of the doctrine predominating in men's minds over the spirit which it was designed to announce. Even Dr. Priestley believed in the approaching advent of Christ and the speedy restoration of the Jews to the land of their fathers. Here then we have the outward form of a great truth perpetuating itself from age to age—and continually renewing an expectation, which has been as continually deceived. If we insist on retaining the literal form—what becomes of Christianity? Is it a delusion?—But that Paul taught this doctrine cannot be doubted; and with him it was no accommodation, but a simple earnest conviction. We must therefore penetrate to the spirit contained in that form, and say, that the essential truth so conveyed was clothed in this particular form by the feeling and belief of the apostolic age—that it was left in some of its attendant circumstances vague and undefined—that it was allowed to assume the shape and movement impressed on it by the time, that it might operate more powerfully on the actual state of public opinion, and, through the force of error temporarily allied with truth, propel it with a greater force and vigour in that heavenward and spiritual direction, out of

which have sprung the characteristic effects and tendencies of Christianity. The truth coming from God and taking full possession of the soul of Paul was this;—that there is a heavenly future, towards which we are all advancing—to which Christ has gone before us—and where he will receive to himself all the followers of truth and right on earth; and that in that eternal world, the just and merciful principles of his religion will be applied as a test of character, and determine the future condition of every son of man as he comes from his course of earthly discipline. Happy for men, that in the anticipation of that solemn futurity, they have a Father of Mercy in whom to trust, and will be tried by the principles which *He* taught and exemplified on earth, who was a revelation of the Father's benignity and love.

We anticipate an objection to the principles here applied, which on the ordinary theory of revelation possesses, we admit, great weight. If our minds are thus left to separate the spirit from the form, and are not bound to admit any conceptions but such as accord with our reason and moral feeling—what becomes, it may be asked, of the authority of revelation, and what evidence do we possess of the truth of doctrines, that is not ultimately derived from our own minds? To this it may be replied, that the value of a revelation is derived from that which it actually communicates—and that we may accept *that* on the test and assurance of reason and moral feeling, which the same reason and moral feeling could not of themselves have originated. But further, the ground on which the truths of the New Testament are offered to our acceptance, is not *authority*—but *faith*—the free surrender of our hearts and wills to that which we feel to be right and true, and which reason follows up with its approval. This in fact is the great distinction between the Law and the Gospel; authority is the principle of the one, as faith is that of the other. When it is said of our Lord, that "he spake as one having authority, and not as the Scribes and Pharisees," it is clear from the context, that this refers rather to the *manner* than to the *matter* of his teachings—that he uttered his truths with the commanding earnestness of full and present conviction, and not as conclusions to be supported by the sophistical distinctions of the Rabbinical expounders of the Law.

It is of course not meant to be denied, that there are *objective* truths in religion—*i. e.* truths which have a real existence, independent of the ideas in our minds—such truths are the being of God and the reality of a future life. But these truths, notwithstanding this objective reality, can only be conceived of *subjectively* by us—*i. e.* must take their form and colour from the actual condition of the conceiving mind; neither can we attain

to any evidence respecting them, which is not ultimately subjective; in other words, derived from the mind within. A predisposition to form ideas of the invisible and spiritual world appear to belong to the original constitution of the human mind; and a consciousness of spiritual relations exist much stronger in some minds than in others. Such minds naturally acquire a religious ascendancy among men; their zeal and earnestness are contagious; they stimulate the fainter consciousness of other minds, and pour into them the light and warmth which fill their own. Now the feelings so excited constitute faith, and the particular direction given to them disposes the mind to contemplate religious objects under a definite point of view.

But if such feelings be the foundation of religious belief—what criterion, it may be asked, do we possess of truth, and how are we to distinguish the suggestions of the eternal spirit from the delusions of enthusiasm? Precisely in the same way that we guard against the chances of error, and look for the marks of truth—on the usual theory of revelation; by the evidences of conformity to reason and our natural sense of rectitude; by the felt and observed effects of what is thus delivered to us, on the heart and life; by the perpetuity of its influence, and its increasing power with the increasing civilization of the world; by its adaptation to transfuse its essential spirit unimpaired into various outward forms according to the changing circumstances of society. These are the outward marks and signs of a true religion—conveyed in the first instance, not by reasoning, but by the power of the spirit, into the human mind; and these all combine in Christianity. What is called the historical testimony to a religion only establishes the existence of certain facts, but cannot determine the religious interpretation of them. Different minds see the same facts in a different light. Even miracles, when the mind is fully convinced of their reality, only lend the sanction of outward authority to doctrines, the truth of which must be established on independent grounds—but cannot add to the reasonableness and credibility of the doctrines themselves. That this is the true view of miraculous sanctions appears from this simple consideration, that no such external authority, how impressive and stupendous soever, could compel the assent of a sound mind to any doctrine that was repugnant to its moral sentiments or subverted the first principles of reasoning.

When the moral standard of the human mind has been purified and fixed by the operation of the spirit of Christianity—developed and cultivated according to the principles we have now explained—the more freely reason is exercised to unfold new forms, and devise higher applications for the spirit, the more active

and vigorous will religion become, and the more intimately will it blend itself with the inward life of the character. The retention of a form, whether in words or in action, when it has ceased to be expressive, when the life of conviction has gone out of it —from a fear of undermining the authority of religion—appears to me to imply a total misconception of the nature of religion, and to be the chief cause of the hollowness and conventionalism that now prevail. If we were to point to the most irreligious periods in the history of mankind, it would be precisely to those in which men had been fettered to forms, with which their free convictions had no longer any sympathy. The superstition to which our popular Protestantism is wedded, is a blind worship of the letter of Scripture—reverence for dead and senseless forms—mere *Bibliolatry*, as Coleridge expressively called it.

When we have grammatically ascertained the original meaning of Scripture, our task of inquiry is not yet completed; we cannot yet be reduced to the alternative of an absolute *yes* or *no*, upon the authority of the doctrine thus primarily yielded to us: —we have still to separate the form from the spirit; and an enlightened Christian will here apply the criterion of truth, which a cultivation of the spirit expressed in the life and ministry of Jesus has established in his mind. We need amongst us a more discriminative use of the Scriptures, that we may read them with an open, free, unscrupulous, and feeling mind—in the same spirit, and with the same unbiassed exercise of the understanding, as we apply to the interpretation of the works of God. We shall never thoroughly enjoy and comprehend the Scriptures, till we perceive that a large portion of them, and some parts even of the New Testament, are poetry—the highest and most glorious poetry, touching on the sublimest themes that ever inspired the lips or pen of man; and that it is only as poetry, from which all the technicalities of our dry and powerless logic must be excluded—that their true spirit can come into our hearts, and quicken the elements of a divine life within us. We cannot conceive of any thing more utterly destructive of the enjoyment of the divinest of books, or more fitted to blind the mind to a perception of its real significance—than the joyless and ungenial scrupulosity with which some commentators have gone through the sacred volume—in every page finding nothing but the reflection of their own doctrinal system, twisting, torturing, and paring down, every passage that seemed at variance with it, and converting, with remorseless cruelty, the warm and breathing life of a rich Oriental poetry, into the fixed and rigid death of the coldest European prose.

When we have embraced the principle, that it is not the form of religion, but its spirit, that giveth life—the Bible at once becomes a new book to us; the fountain of its poetry and its eloquence is unsealed, and its waters flow over into our hearts in streams of refreshing and unfailing copiousness. Through the forms of different ages and of different minds, which rise up before us in delightful and animating variety, we can trace the working and development of the one eternal spirit, which fashions all hearts and minds for its own high purposes. In the child-like simplicity of the patriarchs, in the wisdom of Moses, in the fervent thanksgivings and plaintive melodies of the psalmist, in the inspired majesty of the prophets, in the sublime devotion and philanthropy of Christ, and in the rich unction of the spirit of St. Paul—we can feel, penetrating to us through various channels, which all terminate equally in the primitive source of light—the power of that divine truth, which ever finds a ready audience and a grateful response in every pure, simple, unprejudiced and unscrupulous heart.

When the servile prejudices by which we are now fettered shall have subsided—when we shall have learned to think more of the *sense* intended to be conveyed, than of the *manner* in which it was expressed—we shall probably find it desirable and convenient (without incurring the charge of profaneness, because we cannot regard the Mosaic account of the Creation, the Song of Solomon, or the visions of the Apocalypse, of the same practical importance with the Sermon on the Mount, or Christ's parting address to his disciples) to introduce a more exact classification of the books of Scripture, for the purposes of private reading and public edification, under the different heads of history, poetry, morality, devotion, and doctrine; and recommend them to the study of our youth, and use them in our places of worship, with an intelligent reference to their contents and to their relative value and importance, that will better serve the purposes of religious instruction and true piety, than that vague sentiment of reverence with which some people recur to the Bible, as if its mere words exercised a sort of mystical influence, apart from the spirit of truth and wisdom which breathes in them.

Amidst the apparent tenacity with which different sects adhere to their hereditary faith, traces may still be discovered of a preparation for a more enlarged and catholic conception of Christianity. To its realization a freer use of the Scriptures is indispensable. The point of union which all good men are seeking after, is not to be found in the letter, but in the spirit; not in the *caput mortuum* of creeds and confessions and worn out con-

troversies, but in the living power of a hearty faith and universal love—prepared to adore a Father's presence in all things, and to reverence his image, as a title to honour and affection, in every child of man.

Meanwhile, it is the inevitable condition of such a state of transition, that great and perhaps painful differences of opinion should arise between the best men and the sincerest lovers of truth. To some we shall appear to be advancing too rapidly; to others, to be lingering behind. Let every man be true to his own convictions, and fearlessly do that which his conscience tells him is right.—We are at best but instruments in the hands of a higher Power; and all he asks from us, is fidelity of purpose and endeavour in the exercise of such talents as he has entrusted to us. Children of the same Father, fellow-workers in the same great scheme of moral and intellectual discipline—let us not aggravate the toils and difficulties of our course by mutual distrust and alienation for differences of opinion, which God has decreed should exist, and which it is impossible for man to prevent. Let us possess our minds with a supreme love of truth, and a steadfast confidence in its final results; and let us esteem in each other that earnest desire to discover it, which we trust exists in ourselves;—convinced that, if we live and act in this spirit, we shall each fulfil the particular task of duty assigned us by God, and that, when this short life is over and gone, we shall meet as fellow-labourers under happier influences, and in a wider field of activity, where no differences of opinion and collision of interest shall ever more interrupt the friendship and the sympathy of the virtuous, but every effort they make, and every aspiration they indulge, will be directed by the light of heavenly certainty, and cheered by the influences of pure and unbounded love.

J. J. T.

ART. IV.—PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION; OR, CONSIDERATIONS ON THE COURSE OF LIFE.—Translated from the French of Madame NECKER DE SAUSSURE. 2 vols. London: 1839.

THE valuable work of Madame Necker de Saussure upon Progressive Education has obtained an extensive circulation in France; and the translation of it by one who is evidently a practised and accomplished writer, puts within the reach of English mothers this valuable and practical treatise on the most important of all sciences.

Miss Holland, to whose exertions as translator we are so much indebted, tells us at the commencement of a short interesting preface, compressed, as she informs us, from two separate articles in the original, that the object of the work is to afford "a sort of moral history of life, in which the various means of improvement offered at different ages are pointed out." No one seems better qualified to accomplish such an object than Madame Necker. Endowed with a spirit of patient industry, and of calm inquiry, with a deep power of observation, and with a mind that can accurately understand the workings and development of the human character, she enters upon her task well acquainted with her subject, and cannot fail to carry conviction to every unbiassed reader, by the closeness of her reasonings, and the soundness of her deductions.

The work before us is founded on the axiom, that all progressive education must consist in the steady and perpetual watching of the first development of the child's faculties. It reduces a long course of actual observations and their results to a complete system calculated to advance and perfect, most materially, that important science, the object of which is to improve the moral discipline and intellectual culture of the rising generation. These volumes therefore are a valuable addition to our knowledge of a science which has not hitherto been studied in a manner commensurate to its importance as being the most essential to the real advancement of the human character. For when we reflect that the education begun here is only preparing the human soul for its eternal progress, it becomes, not only a most interesting object, but a sacred duty, to investigate by what means the mind may be most improved, the feelings elevated, the will regulated, and those capacious powers developed which lie folded up in every breathing soul; thus to prepare the man,

not only for the ordeal of this life, but also for that state of moral and intellectual perfectibility to which he is heir.

Education, considered as a science, is a subject which has occupied the attention of some of the deepest thinkers and most enlightened writers, but even such minds as Milton's and Locke's have failed to establish any principles, founded on experience, for the first development of the child's powers and the gradual improvement of his capacity. Their systems are rather founded on theory than on such careful observation and experience as can alone furnish rules of practical utility which may be easily adopted and safely followed by all concerned in the management and instruction of children during the first stages of existence.

To Rousseau is the world indebted for having first made this subject interesting to the feelings and the imagination. No one can read his treatise, *Emile, ou l'Education,* without feeling the original conception, the eloquent description, the bold expression of this enchanting history: from infancy to manhood he accompanies his pupil: from the base to the summit of his ideal hill does he climb: often digressing to gather wayside flowers, and pausing to draw deep draughts of pure thought, and true philosophy. But though every one may read and study his work with advantage, no one can with safety follow it as a guide: his conclusions are the workings of his own imagination, not the result of his experience; his precepts are unsupported by, and often inconsistent with, facts; and we suspect that Emile would present but a melancholy appearance if compelled to engage in the active business of life, and to contend with this our struggling, striving, and self-interested world.

At the close of the preceding, and at the commencement of the present, century, a considerable attention has been given to the subject of early education; and several very interesting treatises on it produced, written, for the most part, in a calm and philosophic spirit. We have the works of Mrs. Hamilton, Mrs. Hannah More, and the enthusiastic Pestalozzi. But the productions which, at the time, evinced the greatest originality, and effected most for the alteration and improvement of existing methods of instruction, were presented by those amiable and enlightened coadjutors, Mr. Edgeworth and his highly-gifted daughter, who employed their talents with so much success for the amusement and instruction of the young.

But though all these, and particularly the last-named, writers have furnished us with matter for much important consideration, and with systems of education, evincing deep and patient thought, and a searching knowledge of the human heart, in one point of

view they must, without doubt, be said to have failed to give rules of easy application; they offer to us the results of observations, but not the observations themselves; the inferences from facts, but not the facts; and often in cases of difficulty and doubt, when the parent hastens to consult these works for real and satisfactory information, they oblige him to trust to the indefinite conjectures of hypotheses, instead of the substantial evidence of actual experience. Free from these objections, the work of Madame Necker stands pre-eminent; we feel that we are there perusing the true and attentive observations of a judicious reader of human life; of one who has power to observe, to analyse, and to compare. Madame Necker must thoroughly have understood the ways, thoughts, feelings, and ideas of children: she gives no ideal delineation of their conduct; she builds no imaginary theory; her work is the result of long and patient examination, and of a constant attention to the wants, wishes, action, and development of the infant mind. She sets down nothing but what she has herself seen; and we feel that she has followed with patience and success a method which she strongly recommends to others; that every parent should keep a diary of her child's progress; of his mental, moral, and physical advancement; of his daily actions; and of his first impressions; thus securing for herself a safe and unerring guide in the education of her offspring, and enabling her to realize again, at any future period, the bright and evanescent scenes of infancy, and to turn at pleasure to a memorial which will unfold to her some of the purest thoughts, the sweetest feelings, that the human heart is capable of enjoying.

"I would have it a true journal, in which an account should be kept of every successive step made by the child; where every vicissitude in its health, whether mental or physical, should be registered, and where the *measure* of the child, in every meaning of the word, as taken at different periods of his age, should be noted down. Words, ideas, knowledge, feelings, every thing, in short, which is either naturally unfolded in the mind, or acquired by education, should be here recorded, together with the first appearance of every endowment and every defect; the original source of which would thus be open to our consideration. And as we cannot describe a child without relating his history, such a journal would be enlivened by the little incidents of each day, and the joy and sorrows peculiar to his age; nor would it be long before the task of keeping it would become to the mother the most interesting of employments. She would feel that she was securing to herself, for the future, the recollection of this most fascinating age; and how delightful would it be, thus to fix the fugitive image of infancy, to prolong to an indefinite period the happiness of beholding its charms, and to have the power of

reviving at any time a representation of these much loved objects, which, even supposing their lives to be spared, must be lost to us, in their character of children."—Vol. i. p. 46. Transl.

The first and second books, which comprise the whole of the first volume of the translation, are occupied with the early stages of infancy. From the very moment of his birth, when he comes fresh from the hands of his Creator, Madame Necker commences the progressive education of the child. It is here that she feels the subject to be almost exclusively her own; and in describing the treatment, or, to speak more accurately, in defining the process of moral development which every child should be subject to, during the first year of his existence, (a period often erroneously looked upon as one when the child's mental and moral being present a mere barren waste, incapable of culture,) she speaks with all the glowing energy and deep impressiveness of one who entertains a firm conviction of the practicability and efficiency of her views, and confidently feels that the theory and principles which she is supporting, and the facts and arguments which she is advancing, are all securely built upon the firm foundations of experience and truth. This portion of the work merits particular regard, from the original and instructive nature of the remarks, and from the wise and wholesome considerations which it offers to the parent. The value of early infantine associations, we fear, is not sufficiently appreciated. Thus we find some mothers who consider children at this early age merely as animated toys, not capable of moral education. Others, whose hearts have beat high with exultation at the birth of a living child, soon, from indolence or caprice, transfer the tutelage of its early years to a servant, surrendering what a mother ought to regard as her proudest privilege; and suffering the first germs of sympathy and love to be excited by an illiterate, and incompetent dependant. At the same time, may we be permitted to say, that we believe the simple love which a kind-hearted nurse feels for the object of her constant care is often more favourable to the development of the affections than the capricious endearments of a woman of the world, whose heart is divided between her offspring and her pleasures. Others again complacently imagine that if the physical wants of an infant are carefully provided for, and it receives a sufficient degree of affection, they have fulfilled all necessary obligations. To all such the present work affords a useful and instructive lesson. It will prove to them how limited is their knowledge of the infant mind, and of the processes which are continually going on for its development. It is while the child hangs speechless,

but not unconscious, upon the mother's arm, that the first sympathies and the earliest dawnings of the future character are to be gradually unfolded; love, sympathy and imitation are the three grand movers of the infant heart; and it is a principle which cannot be too frequently remembered by the mother, that in the mind of her silent infant, "half-lying, half-sitting in its cradle, playing with its little hands," faculties are at work, sympathies are stirring, powers are employed, which call for the closest observation, the most strict attention, and most careful investigation.

"M. Friedlander, a skilful German physician," says Madame Necker, "was much struck when in France, by observing how much it was the custom to keep infants constantly amused. 'It appears to me,' says he, 'that the French mothers are too lively with their children in early infancy, and thus excite their vivacity too much and too soon. In Germany, on the contrary, we constantly hear mothers exhorting their children to be still and quiet.' How many reflections are suggested by this simple remark? who can say what effect may not be produced on the future character by this difference of treatment? who can say that the decided preponderance of the active faculties in the one nation, and of the reflecting faculties in the other, may not be referred to this cause?"—Vol. i. p. 76. Transl.

"We do not in general sufficiently appreciate the great importance of the first year of infancy. We even affect to treat it with contempt, and to speak slightingly of it. Because the infant cannot understand our fine discourses, and is not capable of being regularly instructed, we conclude that it is a mere insignificant little being, requiring only to have its physical wants attended to. Because its life is passed in playfulness, we treat it as a plaything; everything about it seems unimportant, because everything is vague and uncertain; but if this were not the case, if everything were fixed and immutable, our power would be at an end."—Vol. i. p. 98. Transl.

As the child advances from his second to his fourth year, the regulations for the development of his faculties, so as not to accelerate the progress of one part of the moral constitution, and proportionally to retard that of another, are equally deserving of attention.

"A nurse," says Mr. Edgeworth, "may influence the character of a child for life."

This is a simple but important principle, and one which Madame Necker ably carries out into all its various ramifications. She is anxious to convince her readers that the child's "almost innate faculty of imitation" at the period which we are now considering, is full of energy and activity; and to show the importance of the impressions then made on his feelings and imagination.

"This interchange of gentle and affectionate feelings is, in fact, the only means by which we can excite and bring into action the understanding of an infant. Any other language than that of kindness stupifies him; and depresses him even below his natural level. It is, therefore, a great error to use harsh and threatening tones with young children, as a means of deterring them from any action. They may, perhaps, be induced by them to leave off what they were doing, but it is only because we have confused and troubled them; we have broken the chain of their ideas, and perhaps brought them to tears; but when their tears have ceased to flow, they will have forgotten their previous occupation; and having no idea that we have forbidden it, will probably resume it at the first opportunity. It is only by means of sympathy that we can attach any meaning to our words: the tone of the voice, and the expressions of the countenance, assist in explaining them; and hence arises a great difference in the degree of ease with which they understand us; if, therefore, we check this disposition by our harshness, they will no longer be able to comprehend what we wish. It is true that by associating the recollection of an impression of fear with a certain action, they may be led to abstain from it: in this way, too, we teach and tame brute animals; but if we adopt this plan with the children, they will soon learn from it another lesson. Seeing us angry, they will be sure to imitate the example we have set them; and the harsh expressions which we have used towards them will, ere long, be applied by them to us." . . .

"Be, then, particularly careful never to be angry either with your children, or in their presence. Till they are three or four years old, the most justifiable indignation will appear to them only anger. . . . . When we reflect on the great advantage in after life, of a cool temper, it ought to be one of our most earnest desires to obtain this advantage for our children.—Vol. i. pp. 107, 109. Trans.

The chapter devoted by Madame Necker to the subject of "Obedience," a duty so deservedly esteemed, but of which the *principles* and proper modes of cultivation are so little understood, will well repay the parent for his careful consideration. We have not space to follow Madame Necker through all her reasonings, but the following *Penal Code*, for children of two years old, seems to be so exceedingly judicious, and so likely to be efficacious, that we offer no apology to our readers for venturing to extract it.

"*Disobedience caused by forgetfulness.* Oppose the continuance of the act by renewing, in a kind manner, the prohibition.

"*Relapse a little more voluntary.* Assume a serious air, and warn the child, that, on a repetition of the fault, his power to disobey will be taken away.

"*Relapse entirely voluntary.* Put the threatened punishment into execution, silently making such arrangement as will render disobedience impossible.

"In this last case, the child will generally be made angry, and will

show his anger by endeavouring to punish you; he will pretend to caress some one else, and do his utmost to irritate you. As long as the prescribed bounds are not passed, take no notice of his intentions; but if he proceed to open rebellion, if, tired of your inattention to his trifling faults, he commit more serious ones, you must then at once and decidedly put an end to them. Take the little culprit by the hand, and, without speaking, gravely put him behind a great arm-chair—the terrible place of punishment. It is amusing to observe the secret air of triumph, which mingles with his tears, at the idea that he has at last succeeded in disturbing you. But make this feeling of triumph as short and as trifling as possible, by taking care to preserve a perfectly calm manner.". . . . . .

"Quietly resume your occupation, and you may be sure that, in a very short time, his tears will either cease to flow, or the feeling which causes them will be changed; they will no longer be tears of angry triumph, but a gentle appeal to your pity; and the slightest look will bring the culprit to your arms. An opening of the heart, a tender and cordial reconciliation will succeed, and the child will voluntarily own his sorrow for what he has done; a confession more easily obtained, and more sincerely pronounced, than a cold asking for pardon. What you wish for is not the humiliation of your child, but the expression of affectionate regret, of a real return to goodness."—Vol. i. pp. 140—2. Transl.

The power and necessity of a truthful disposition which cannot be too early or too diligently cultivated is admirably delineated.

"But of what importance to every one is truth of character?". ."False-hood and vice are always found in close connection. We first learn to dissemble because we have done wrong, and then continue to do wrong because we have learnt to dissemble." . . "By obliging your child, therefore, to adhere strictly to the truth, you secure his moral existence; an existence of far more importance than his physical one; an existence, the loss of which destroys our peace of mind, and reduces us to the most humiliating state of uneasiness.".....

"Conscientious truthfulness is not of spontaneous growth; it has to be implanted; and it cannot be implanted and cultivated too early. In order to do this, we must begin by making children understand as soon as possible that their words must agree, not with their own wishes, or those of others, but with facts, a thing which they would seldom discover if left to themselves. In relating to them the circumstances of any event in which they have been actors or witnesses, let them observe that you are careful to give them a true and faithful narrative. They will very soon be so much impressed by this, that if you commit the slightest error in your recital, they will, even with a degree of pedantry, correct you. Whenever this is the case, you should, by your warm and sincere thanks, prove to them how much importance you attach to accuracy."—Vol. i. pp. 155, 156, 157. Transl.

The great object of infant education must be to lay a moral

foundation for the advancing years of childhood; and as the mind gradually unfolds its powers, as reason and reflection begin to be more frequently and strongly exercised, it becomes us, most especially, to sow the first seeds of those moral and religious feelings, which will exercise so powerful an influence upon the character, at every succeeding period of life. Let no parent imagine that the child at this early age is not sufficiently advanced, either in thought or understanding, to receive the first impressions of religion; at no stage of his existence can he be said to be wholly incapable of receiving a lively and enduring impress of those pure feelings and solemn thoughts, which will awaken a strain like that of the softest music in the heart of the young child, calculated to enliven and delight him, to strengthen him for his earthly pilgrimage, and to animate and support him at the hour when all feeling, faculty, and enjoyment shall be fast fading away.

"In many respects children are happily constituted for the fulfilment of this universal duty (religion). Not bound down as we are by fixed habits, their connection with earth is not so intimate. They can believe in what is unseen; they can love without having any very definite idea of the object of their love.". . . . . "Their whole language is that of prayer; feeling more strongly than we do the sense of their weakness, they also feel more strongly their need of help, while at the same time their filial affection is more warm and lively: what then is wanting to bring them near to God? Religion already slumbers in their breast; requiring, not to be brought into existence, but only to be awakened."—Vol. i. p. 195, Transl.

It is however most important, particularly at this early age, that religion should be presented to a child in a simple and attractive form. Let her never wear before him a dark or repulsive aspect. Encircle her with all that is true, and good and beautiful in creation: let the young child be taught to see the "glory of the grass, and the splendour of the flower;" let him be told of God, and of God's goodness in the green earth, the flowery leas, the eloquent hills, and the eternal skies; and then let his love be kindled, and his sympathies aroused, as he is told of him who has mercifully said, "Suffer little children to come unto me," and "out of the mouths of babes and sucklings is perfected praise." Again therefore, we repeat, the first seeds of religion can never be sown too early. Nothing can be more erroneous, and more dangerously delusive, than to imagine with Rousseau, that impressions produced in after years by sudden surprise, by some violent appeal to the passions, or extraordinary revulsion of the feelings, can ever produce the same effect, or

exert an equal influence, as old associations and established habits.

"The streams of life," says Madame Necker, "will return to its accustomed course, and any religious ideas will be swept away in its current.". . . . . "It is indeed possible, that through the medium of terror we might succeed in inspiring this feeling at a later age; but it would in that case most likely assume an inauspicious character. It is in the happy period of infancy, when all nature seems to smile upon us, when all our fellow creatures love and protect us, that the idea of a God who loves and protects us easily takes possession of the soul. And can there be a greater blessing than such an idea? Can it ever be sufficiently appreciated? Can we estimate too highly the value of a hope which is never exhausted, which points out to us a brighter world beyond this,—a celestial perfection above all human perfection, a happiness more pure and more unbounded than anything of which we can here form an idea, and which even persuades us that evils themselves are intended for our good. 'Though he slay me,' says Job, 'yet will I trust in Him.' Where this feeling exists, solitude, exile, old age, death, no longer exist; God is present; He sustains us, He hears us, He speaks to us, He encourages us, and though the danger be great, imminent, inevitable, though the shades of death may surround us, He will receive us into his bosom. When this feeling prevails, it tinges every thing with a softly coloured light, an atmosphere of love is diffused over all nature; men, animals, even the material creation, plants, rivulets, mountains, every thing is loved; every thing is the work of God; every thing speaks a language which tells us He is our Father, and the peace and happiness which He breathes into our souls declare this to us in a still stronger language."—Vol. i. pp. 202, 203.

Our attention has hitherto been confined to the early cultivation of the child's moral and religious feelings. We must now proceed to bring other faculties into action; our views henceforth, for a time, must be occupied particularly, though not exclusively, with the education of the intellect. The period has now arrived when the attention of the child must be called to those subjects which will be serviceable to him as he advances in life; and he must be accustomed to habits of application, and to the industrious exertion of the powers of the mind. The "preliminary chapter" of the second volume of the translation offers upon this point a wide field for examination; it abounds with wise and thoughtful considerations. Parents at this period often fall into a common, but most pernicious, error; from an inconsiderate desire of *bringing forward*, as they imagine, the intellectual powers of their children, they burden them with foolish and injudicious acquirements, they weigh down the memory with facts and details, with accounts of history or geography, which their child cannot understand, or with the nature and properties of

objects which he cannot appreciate, and yet fancy that "they are cultivating the intellect;" nothing can be more erroneous than such a system. For ourselves, we think that there cannot be a more melancholy object than to see a young bright being, intended only for joy and animation, and activity, called upon to exhibit its extraordinary attainments; to lisp out to us some specimen of its knowledge, or to recite the verses of some long poem, that must be utterly unintelligible to it, and impressed upon its memory by constant repetition.*

"The exclusive importance attached to the mere acquisition of *knowledge* forms one of the dangerous snares of education. We are enticed by it to choose expeditious methods, and to avoid difficulties. The child appears to make a certain progress; he knows the things which you have taught him; he performs what you have showed him how to perform; but try him in a different direction, require from him some new exercise of his faculties, and he is quite at a loss. And even when arrived at manhood, this may continue to be the case, almost without our being aware of it. By the help of memory and imitation, we often see people make their way tolerably well. The degree of civilization at which we are arrived has created a form for almost everything; a mechanical education extends its influence over the whole course of life; and hence it is that the number of insignificant beings is so great; beings who increase numerical amount without adding to value—examples of that useless species, the common-place characters of their age and country."

"It has almost always happened that instructors have been too much influenced by partial and confined views. They have not troubled themselves about the cultivation of the faculties, when communicating their instruction in the first instance; and when convinced by experience of the necessity of this, they have still overlooked the importance of preserving these different faculties in harmony with each other. They have not only entirely neglected many which are as essential as the enlargement of the mind to the condition of human beings, but even when occupied exclusively with the improvement of the mind, they have not taken a general view of the whole of its attributes, and have in turns overlooked each of its most noble endowments. Sometimes memory has been cultivated at the expense of the judgment; sometimes the reasoning powers have been exercised, while the imagination has been entirely neglected; and sometimes the faculty of investigation has been invested with such high powers, that it has been thought possible for the pupil to discover for himself all the wonders of science; so that making no use of the stores of knowledge accumulated by time, the ignorance of the earliest ages has been engrafted in the intellectual weakness of infancy."—Vol. ii. pp. 12, 13, 17, 18. Transl.

* We allude, of course, to the common, but very injurious, practice of forcing long pieces of verse upon a child's memory, by the means of constant "*drumming*." Some children have a natural ear for rhythm, and will often recollect the words of a short poem from merely hearing it once or twice recited; this we allow to be as natural and beneficial to the child, as gratifying and delightful to the parent.

Can any system, we ask then, be more manifestly injudicious? The fallacy of it would be still more apparent if we were to follow a similar plan in physical education. We lately met with some remarks upon this subject, so admirably conceived, and convincingly expressed, that, although they are somewhat long, we are sure our readers will not be angry with us for their insertion. "Put the case," says the writer, "of a boy of a weakly constitution and effeminate habits; and suppose that family connections and interest make it seem desirable that he should enter the army; and that he be committed to the care of some one, an old soldier if you like, who professes to prepare him for his military career." "At the end of four or five years his father may think it right to inquire into his fitness for his profession. 'Have you studied tactics?' 'No, sir.'—'Have you studied gunnery?' 'No, sir.'—'Are you perfect in the last instructions issued from the Horse-Guards for the manœuvres of cavalry?' 'I have never seen them, sir.'—'Have you learnt the broad-sword exercise?' 'No.'—'Can you put a company of infantry through their drill?' 'No.'—'Have you practised platoon firing?' 'No.'—'Can you even fix a bayonet in a musket?' 'I never tried, sir.'—After such an examination we may imagine the father expostulating indignantly with the veteran under whose care his son was placed. The latter might reply, 'Sir, when you entrusted your son to my training, he was weak and sickly. He had little appetite, and was fastidious in his eating: he could bear no exposure to the weather: he could not walk two miles without fatigue: he was incapable of any severer exercise: he was unwilling, and indeed unable, to join in the athletic sports of boys of his age. Now he is in perfect health, and wants and wishes for no indulgence: he can make a hearty dinner on any wholesome food, or go without it, if need be: he will get wet through, and care nothing about it: he can walk ten or fifteen miles a day: he can ride; he can swim; he can skate; he can play a game at cricket, and enjoy it: though he has not learnt the broad-sword exercise, he fences well: though he has never handled a soldier's musket, he is an excellent shot with a fowling-piece. He has a firm foot, a quick eye, and a steady hand—he is a very pretty draughtsman; he is eager to enter his profession, and you may take my word for it, sir, he will make a brave and active officer.'"*

Such an answer, we imagine, would be conclusive. Mental health and strength must be secured by the same system; and "the teacher cannot employ himself better than in thoroughly

* A lecture "On the Introduction of the Natural Sciences into General Education," by Henry Malden, M.A., Professor of Greek, University College, London, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

cultivating the intellect; in rendering this admirable instrument as perfect as possible, and thereby fitting the pupil for any situation in which he may hereafter be placed."

It is true that in following up the system which we are advocating, parents will find at this period some of their greatest difficulties. The restlessness of children's dispositions, the quickness of their fancy, and their incapability of appreciating the value or utility of their present exercises, all unite to raise obstacles in the way of their instruction: but in the hands of careful and judicious parents there are placed many stimulants to arouse into activity the dormant understanding of the child: and we think the following remarks of Madame Necker are calculated to render very valuable assistance to the instructor at this period of the child's education.

"One mistake into which we are very apt to fall is that of requiring the first efforts of a child's attention, even before it has been exercised in any other way, to be directed to objects totally uninteresting to him. Thus before we have accustomed him to examine any thing, we desire him to distinguish A from B, from which he cannot possibly derive any pleasure. But as we have two difficulties to surmount—that of fixing his attention, and that of interesting him in objects not of a nature to afford him any gratification—it would surely be a better plan to undertake them separately. Let us, in the first place, lead children to observe and examine such things as are likely to interest them; as, for instance, the innumerable amusing objects in nature, the various parts of flowers, particularly those which have any resemblance to familiar objects, such as boats, hammers, cups, &c., and afterwards let us exercise their ingenuity and attention by making them point out the representations of these objects in drawings or engravings. By these preparatory steps the labour of learning to read will be very much facilitated."—Vol. ii. p. 69. Transl.

But the most effective instrument the parent can employ for the advancement of his child, is placed entirely in himself. Let him be most particularly careful to observe a strict regularity in the course of his instruction; so that the hours, or rather minutes of the lessons may recur as nearly as possible at the same times; the child will thus return to his task, as to an affair of duty, and the feeling that it is a duty will lighten the fatigue; his pride, in this case a proper pride, will be roused, to perform properly an act which gives him an importance to himself; and the smile of approbation, which plays upon his mother's face, will be doubly estimated if his conscience tells him that he has deserved it.

One danger is, however, to be avoided in the use and application of these admirable instruments, with which nature has

supplied us for securing the attention of the young; not to overstrain their first exertions; nor to place that forced and constant pressure upon the mind, which cannot fail to produce a weariness, often a satiety and disgust, subversive of all present instruction, and liable in after years to prostrate our best endeavours, and to correct the progress of intellectual improvement.

"How many faults in this respect are constantly committed! our very eagerness to encourage their tastes too often only tends to destroy them. Suppose a child is fond of drawing; we begin perhaps by gently urging him to devote himself to the occupation; we try to make him ashamed of giving it up; he begins to feel a degree of restraint associated with the employment, and his pleasure in it vanishes; sometimes our over anxiety to afford children the means of indulging their tastes, only produces satiety. If they show an interest in natural history, we immediately overwhelm them with books and engravings; or we present them with ready-made little collections, and in so doing are almost sure to disgust them. These well-arranged specimens of minerals, &c., with their hard names written on bits of paper, which are on no account to be torn, are soon consigned to some empty cupboard. They are proudly exhibited once or twice, and then completely forgotten; nor does the hope of finding anything equally beautiful ever enter the imagination of the little owner."....

"There is a fastidious delicacy attendant on these tastes, which flourishes best on a spare diet, and sinks under too great an abundance of nourishment. You may create a taste for science by means of the pebbles in your garden walk, and destroy it by the possession of a museum."—Vol. ii. pp. 72, 73. Transl.

Although it may be well, however, to spread as many flowers as we can over the first approaches to learning, we consider it to be most mistaken and inconsiderate kindness to allow the child to follow only the inclination of his own will. Difficulties, trials, and privations, are the sad and inevitable attendants upon humanity, our natural and necessary inheritance; and surely, therefore, those parents are guilty of a serious mistake who forbear to inure their children to them in time, from a weak and unreasonable apprehension of too soon anticipating their approach.

"Hence, arose," says Madame Necker, "a multitude of little inventions and stratagems for communicating knowledge to children under the disguise of amusement. But, besides the deficiency of this system in many other respects, it was wanting in what is absolutely essential to the success of every plan—truth." "By pretending to have an end in view which is not the real object, we lose both the respect and love of children. Suppose, for instance, a mother wishes to commence the in-

struction of her child by teaching him to read. How does she set about the task? Having made her preparatory arrangements, she tells him that she has got a new and amusing game to show him. Coloured ivory counters, pictures of animals or flowers on card, smart, gay-looking books, are produced to captivate his imagination. For a time he is completely the dupe of all this artifice; and as long as the attraction of novelty remains, comes with eagerness to his lesson. But in a little while he finds it more entertaining to vary the sounds of the different letters, and when A is pointed out to him, will call it O; or he will amuse himself with performing some feat of agility between the naming of each letter, or will choose rather to build houses with the cards than put them to their proper use. His mother wishing to preserve the idea of amusement, and yet at the same time to accomplish the end she has in view, endeavours with an ill-assumed gaiety to recall his wandering attention; but he sees through her purpose, and while taking care to frustrate it, derives entertainment from her vexation; and a disposition most deplorable in itself, but the inevitable consequence of such a system of deception, is thus fostered. Declare openly your intention of teaching, and the child soon submits; his respect for you is even augmented; but if you try to deceive him with a false pretext, he will cling to your pretended object with determined obstinacy, and will oblige you to preserve your consistency, by making that really an amusement which you announced as such."—Vol. ii. pp. 120, 121.

We have thus endeavoured to call attention to a system adapted to cultivate the child's powers of attention; and to secure that intellectual strength and firmness which will form the best foundation for any future superstructure. For the improvement and full development of the reasoning and inquiring powers, nothing is more essential than to possess within ourselves a spirit of investigation, and a love of information, as well as a willingness to associate our children in the pleasure which we receive from our pursuits.

"If our children," says Madame Necker, "see our interest is awakened, and our curiosity excited by the idea of making some new observation, or ascertaining some new fact, they will soon try to anticipate our discoveries. If they observe us interested in the cultivation of flowers, in watching the labours of the bee, or the metamorphosis of insects, they will soon be delighted themselves with these occupations. Example, emulation, curiosity,—the most natural stimulants at an age when pleasure is so vividly enjoyed, and the idea of utility so indistinct,—will all act in unison."—Vol. ii. pp. 73, 74. Transl.

In short, it is by a constant and unwearying attention on our parts, by a quick readiness to lay hold of every passing thought, and by our willingness to return a prompt answer to every inquiry, that we shall most effectually call forth and mature the rational and reflecting faculties of the child.

"Nothing tends so much to strengthen this feeling—nothing keeps it so constantly alive, as giving the pupil an interest in his own education. If we frequently consult him on the best means of increasing his application, his industry, his goodness, if we judiciously examine with him the various obstacles which prevent the accomplishment of his good intentions,—he will soon begin to have a pleasure in pointing out what he thinks would be the best plan to be pursued; he will be interested in the success of what he has suggested, and will at last regard the performance of his duty as the most important object of his life."—Vol. ii. pp. 60, 61. Transl.

But while we are thus directing the attention to the gradual development of the mental powers, we must be particularly careful not to lose sight of that which must be the end and aim of all moral culture,—we mean religion. It is in vain to fertilize the intellect, if we suffer the heart to continue sterile. The objects of all true and proper education must be twofold; one of these, to accustom the child to habits of thought and self-investigation; we must teach him to reason, to reflect, to analyse; to draw deductions from all he hears, sees, reads, or feels: from conversation, from nature, from passing events. The grander and more important object is, at all periods of the child's progressive instruction, to cultivate the pure affections of his heart; to imbue him with a fervent feeling of love to God, and benevolence to man; and to impress deeply and indelibly upon him the proud and vivifying thought, that he has within him a pure Intelligence, sent down from God; which will gradually advance him to perfection.

Our space is too limited, and we have already drawn too largely from these interesting volumes, to follow Madame Necker through the remainder of this early course. The parent who thinks with her that "all the power of reasoning, of which children are capable, should be exercised, and combined with their best feelings, in order to lead them to submission," will do well to read the chapter on "Willing or Deliberative Obedience." We have already shown that the vital, actuating principle of education must be religion; it should be made the prime mover in the child's heart of all his motives, and the main spring of all his moral and intellectual exertions; the parent, therefore, will derive much valuable advice from the chapters of her work, devoted by Madame Necker exclusively to "the Foundation of Morality," "the Development of the Religious Feelings," and "the Auxiliary Means to be employed." We have not space to enter into the delicate and much-disputed subject of rewards and punishments. At present we can only say, that, for the most part, we coincide

with the views of Madame Necker. The following precepts we consider admirable:—

"A punishment decreed beforehand, and inflicted when the specified fault is committed, places a sort of barrier between the culprit and his offended parent; which opposes any excess of indulgence, and renders violent expressions of anger unnecessary. The father punishes, not as a satisfaction to his own feelings, but that he may be true to his word; which no consideration should ever tempt him to violate."..... "But the punishment must never be remitted; this would only tend to make his government appear arbitrary; and, when at last obliged to inflict it, he might be considered capricious or cruel. It is not so much the severity, as the certainty of punishment, which renders it efficacious. If there be the least doubt as to its being executed, children not only willingly encounter the risk, but are even pleasurably excited by the idea of setting it at defiance.—What we ought particularly to guard against with regard to punishments, is, the supposition that, by increasing their severity, we shall obtain what we were unable to accomplish at first. When a child has once submitted to chastisement of any kind, we ought to take it for granted that he is corrected; and laying aside all idea of further threatenings, grant an entire pardon. This observation applies particularly to the case of obstinacy. When a determined resolution is shown not to obey a command, it is more than doubtful whether any good will result from obliging a child to do so. If we have recourse to violence for this purpose, we render him cowardly; fear triumphs over courage, and physical over moral feeling; and thus an agency is destroyed, frequently misapplied, no doubt, but the want of which may sometimes be regretted. This is a case in which punishment, if necessary, is perfectly justifiable; but, having inflicted it, do not afterwards insist on the performance of the point in dispute: do not even allude to it; by making the child submit to your chastisement, you have sufficiently asserted your rights. You have saved your own dignity, without offending his."—Vol. ii. pp. 186, 187, 188. Transl.

The young instructor, who must often have occasion to consult experience older and more practised than his own, cannot fail to borrow many valuable reflections from the chapters devoted to "Employment of Time," "Practical Rules for the Cultivation of the Faculties of Attention and Reason," aswell as "for the Cultivation of the Memory;" but no portion of the book will be read with deeper interest, or afford more useful admonition, than the chapters which investigate and explain the peculiar and ever-restless properties of the imagination. The pains employed by Madame Necker, in the two volumes of her work, to show the rise and progress, the capabilities and abuses of this active organ, prove the great importance she attaches to its early cultivation. No one however, capable of reflection, will disallow the truth and soundness

of her views. Some of the most pleasurable sensations which we can experience, owe their origin to a lively but well-disciplined imagination. It brightens the path of infancy, giving reality and life to the sports and amusements of the child: as he advances in years it imparts vitality to his most elevated ideas; taste, order, harmony, and beauty, weave their mystic web of pleasing and refined enjoyment beneath its all-pervading and all-inspiring influence; "it spreads its brilliant net-work over the whole face of nature, and finds in every direction meshes to which it can attach itself;" it enlarges the sphere of pure and innocent gratification, and spiritualizes the heart to a full appreciation of that benignity, which,

> "Not content
> With every food of life to nourish man,
> By kind illusions of the wandering sense,
> Thus makes all nature Beauty to the eye,
> Or Music to the ear."

The "*prudent*" parent, therefore, who from a false estimation of its utility, or an idle apprehension of its delusiveness, endeavours to arrest the progress and subvert the influence of this animating faculty, not only robs the child of his dearest and most enviable possession—the genuine enthusiasm of a youthful spirit—but entails upon him also a weight of misery, as the inevitable result of his withering and injurious system; for although the imagination may be perverted, it can never be destroyed; forbidden to enjoy the rich luxuriance of its own nature, it degenerates to a poisonous and noxious weed.

"It is never at a loss," says Madame Necker, "for the means of exercising its power of turning every thing into a cause of fanciful apprehension. Old age is always seen in the distance; illness constantly impending; and death ready at any moment to seize on his victim. To such an imagination, poverty—always a positive evil—appears immediate and certain; and the smallest sacrifice in favour of another, dangerous. Presenting always the dark side of any doubtful event to the mind, and thus causing it to live under the reflected influence of a gloomy futurity, the imagination, if allowed to feed on itself, instead of being led by a judicious education to exercise its powers on external objects, destroys every consolatory feeling, and too often fosters the most deplorable passions."

To the age of ten a similar system of moral and intellectual instruction is recommended both for boys and girls. After this period the grand line of demarcation must be drawn: Madame Necker has devoted another and a larger portion of her work

to the full development of the female character ;* and confines herself in the remainder of the present volume exclusively to the education of the boy, examining the method best adapted to secure his mental vigour and activity, and most effectually to prepare him for his future obligations. Her remarks prove that she has reflected much upon the subject, and that she is well acquainted with all the springs and wheels which work within a boy's heart. Until the age of ten or twelve she recommends that his instruction should take place *at home*; she reprobates the folly of sending a boy during these early years, from the paternal roof, not only as prejudicial to his improvement, but also as liable to weaken that pure and sacred tie which ought always to exist between the parent and his child. The following passage partially explains the views of Madame Necker, and is, at the same time, so replete with feeling, pathos, and good sense, that we should not do justice either to her or to our readers if we did not allow ourselves to extract it.

"How much is included in the simple expression, *remaining in the family circle*! If the child can, indeed, be retained at home long enough to have acquired a keen relish for domestic pleasures before he has learnt to enjoy any others, how many recollections, how many feelings and images, alike pleasing in themselves, and favourable to morality, will thus be formed during the years which I am so anxious to claim for the parental roof; I do not of course refer now to those happy countries where the few hours spent every day at the college do not interfere with general domestic habits; but where this is not the case, what courage must be required to separate ourselves from a son before either he is known to us or we to him! to give up our power of obtaining glimpses of his character,—transient and uncertain at first, but becoming every day clearer and more determined, and of being thus enabled to form plans for his education founded upon personal experience! Besides, of how much happiness do we thus deprive the child! How indistinct in his eyes do all the relations of domestic life become! No lasting friendship will afterwards strengthen the ties of nature; sisters and brothers hardly seem to exist for each other, when the recollection of that time when all their pleasures and all their griefs were in common, is carried too far back into the twilight mists of infancy. And all those peculiar circumstances of situation, fortune, friends, or neighbourhood, which constitute the individuality of a family—every thing which cannot yet interest a child of seven years old—must be for ever lost to him.

* We have very great pleasure in subjoining the following "Note by the translator:"—"Madame Necker has redeemed her pledge on this subject by the publication of a third volume of her work, entirely devoted to the consideration of female education and character, a translation of which is intended to follow the publication of these volumes."—Vol. ii. p. 278. Transl.

At least he will learn them only at an age when the whole course of his thoughts will have taken a different direction, but even this is not the most important loss, nor one which is entirely irreparable; the essential consideration is, that in schools the education of the heart is very much neglected, and that the task of inspiring our children with an actuating and enlightened spirit of religion ought to be trusted to no one but ourselves. Some good dispositions will, no doubt, be left in the heart from those devotional feelings which are so easily excited in early childhood; such slight impressions, however, like a thin vapour, are swept away by the gales of life. But a religious culture, which is continued till the pupil is ten or twelve years old, leaves a far deeper impression; and, what must especially interest the mother, on whom this religious education generally devolves, the same feelings which will prove their most certain safeguard and consolation will always be associated in the memory of her sons with her gentle image, and will be indissolubly connected with filial love."—Vol. ii. pp. 281, 282, 283. Transl.

When the boy, however, arrives at the age of ten or twelve, when his principles of religion and morality may be said to be secured, and his ideas of right and wrong accurately defined, the views of Madame Necker coincide with those of the great Roman educationist, and she speaks decidedly in favour of a public system of instruction: we have not time to enter into this much-contested question, or to discuss the comparative merits of the public or private education; we would only state that the objections so constantly raised against the former, seem to us to be often drawn from partial and inconsiderate conclusions, and, indeed, not unfrequently to be more than counterbalanced by the various imperfections and deficiencies unavoidably attendant upon a private system. The valuable institutions of our country devoted to education, venerable from their antiquity, and consecrated by the memories of the wise and great and good, have been accused, and perhaps justly so, of a blind and obstinate attachment to established forms and obsolete prejudices.—This feeling, however, is fast upon the wane; a spirit of improvement is even now working within our public seminaries, conformable with the character of the age. The useless and hurtful excrescences engrafted by the hand of time will soon, we hope, be rooted out. And then, but not till then, we may safely and unhesitatingly declare of our great and ancient foundations, that their whole system of instruction, so calculated to discipline the mind to habits of steady application and persevering industry, to imbue it with the principles of pure and correct taste, and to call forth all its hidden powers, will,

of itself, be sufficient to substantiate their utility and importance; while the healthy nature of the play-ground, the high ideas of honour which prevail among the boys, and the general feeling of equality, will all unite to abate the presumption without weakening the elasticity of the spirit, and to inure the youth to that patient endurance, honest energy, and manly exertion, which will best prepare him for the scenes of active life.

ART. V.—SERMONS ON PRACTICAL SUBJECTS. By the late L. CARPENTER, LL.D. 8vo. pp. 502. London: Mardon and Green.

THIS volume, we doubt not, will be received by that portion of the public to whom it is more particularly addressed, with an interest arising from their just appreciation not only of its own merits, but of the distinguished character of its lamented author. Volumes of sermons, especially posthumous sermons, derive in fact their chief prospect of a favourable reception from the respect and attachment which many of their readers may be expected to feel for the preacher, with whom they may have been personally connected, or whom they have esteemed for the active and useful character which he has sustained through life. It would be unreasonable to seek in such publications for much new or original matter; selected, as they most commonly are, without any very distinct or definite principle of choice, from the author's weekly preparations for the stated duties of the pulpit. They have been composed in general without the most distant view to publication; probably in haste, and too often in hurried and inadequate intervals, which would have been more naturally devoted to repose and relaxation from other laborious and absorbing employments. They have rarely if ever received the author's final corrections; and if composed as they ought to be, with an immediate view to their effect and impressiveness when addressed to the preacher's accustomed hearers, will often be on that very account less fitted to appear with advantage from the press, divested of all those local and personal adaptations which tended to bring them home to the wants and the hearts of their hearers.

Many preachers, also, (and we believe that this was the case to a considerable extent with Dr. Carpenter,) are in the habit of trusting much to the impulse of the moment; and in such cases, when the feelings are warm and excited, and aided by a sufficient power and facility of extemporaneous expression, it may be presumed that these unpremeditated effusions which do not appear in the manuscript, were frequently the portions of the discourse which made the strongest impression, and were heard with the most lively interest. We may add, that it will be almost always found that even the best sermons derive no small portion of their effect, not so much from their intrinsic merit, as from their adaptation to the style and manner, to the peculiar

habits of thought and feeling, and even of pronunciation and delivery in the preacher; so that they will often be read by the friends to whom they recal such personal and incidental associations with a species of interest in which others cannot easily participate.

Such publications therefore should not be criticised without a due regard to the peculiar circumstances under which they make their appearance. Not that we should wish to claim a more than ordinary share of allowance on this ground for the volume before us, which, if we mistake not, the friends and admirers of Dr. Carpenter will find on the whole to be such as they will be willing to associate with his honoured name. They are for the most part of a practical and devotional cast, and we think the Editor has acted judiciously in regulating his selection upon this principle. For as he justly observes in the preface, owing to the circumstances in which the author was placed, and the frequent occasions in which he was drawn out into a public vindication of his peculiar views of Christian doctrine, the greater part of his published writings are of a controversial character. And though he might have added with equal justice, that notwithstanding the excitement almost unavoidable in such contests, and the provocation arising from the frequent traces of a very different spirit in his opponents, there is not to be found in any of these writings a single deviation from his accustomed character of Christian gentleness and forbearance, or a single line which in his cooler moments he would wish to blot, yet they cannot from their nature exhibit to one who knows him only by his writings, a complete picture of his mind, or represent him in the aspect in which he was chiefly viewed by those who knew him best. For when *they* think of Dr. Carpenter, it will not be merely as the acute and judicious scripture critic, or the successful controversialist, but as the generous friend, the active and enlightened philanthropist, the faithful and affectionate pastor, whose heart was ever in his work,—the consistent and conscientious Christian, who exemplified in his own life the character he delighted to pourtray in his public instructions, of an habitually religious man.

To many readers of these discourses, as the editor observes, and we have already hinted, there may appear little in the thoughts themselves with which they are not familiar. But there will often be found *that* in the expression of them, which bears the character of the writer, and finds its way to hearts closed against appeals which some may deem more powerful. Let it not be supposed, however, that there is an entire absence of what may fairly be called originality. For example, there are few

readers, we are inclined to think, who can rise from a careful perusal of the sermon, "Christ alone leadeth to the Father," or the very interesting and pleasing train of reflections on the influence of the circumstances preceding and attending the birth of Jesus on his future character, without feeling that his thoughts had been agreeably and profitably carried into a channel in which they have not often flowed before. In the first of these, (which if we may judge by the date, may have been suggested by the recent visit to Bristol, of the British Association,) he justly observes, that however true it may be that God hath not left himself without witness in the works of creation, yet it may happen, and has too often happened, that those who have addressed themselves most assiduously to the perusal of these works, without having been previously led by Christ to the Father, have failed to discover this witness. In the Gospel revelation, we find "a provision to support the weakness of the human intellect always exposed to the bondage of sense, and to raise the drooping faith towards Him whom eye shall never see, and towards abodes which here can only be the object of the imagination. 'He that hath seen me, saith the Saviour, hath seen the Father;' in him we have the image of the invisible God; through him we have access to the Father of spirits; by him too, passing as he did through death to a deathless life, we have the assurance implanted which the enfeebling approach of death conquers not, that death will be swallowed up in victory. We need *all* this, when Science has taught her most glorious discoveries, or led us among her minutest wonders.

"Were there not influences, direct or indirect, from Revelation, would the contemplation of the laws which govern the natural world, in the phenomena of the heavens, and in the organization of living beings from the lowest to the highest, lead us to intimate communion of spirit with Him who impressed them upon his creation? Would not even the very regularity and uniformity of operations tend to deaden the sensibility to the Invisible Cause, in his personal connections and agency? Would not the vague sentiment of *principle* and *agency*, even where religious conviction and feeling were maintained, take the place of that vital, inspiring faith in him who is invisible, which impresses the sense of God upon the soul, and cherishes the life of God within; which thus throws a sacred radiance without, making every object to be viewed as the production of his wisdom, every event as under the direction of his Providence, every power of nature as his agency, every law of nature as the mode of his operation, which thus gives life to the belief that nothing is without God, and prepares the soul to be

his temple? Without the support of Revelation, the mind would be misguided even by the regularity of nature, and bewildered in the infinity and variety of its wise contrivances."—p. 12.

He proceeds to point out several remarkable illustrations of his principle, in what we cannot but regard as the lamentable aberrations and inconsistencies of some of the most eminent votaries of modern science.

Dr. Carpenter is well known to have received the introductory chapters of Luke's Gospel, while he rejected those of Matthew, and, interpreting the former without reference to the latter, to have considered the encouraging assurance of the Divine messenger to the destined mother of Jesus, (Luke i. 38), as implying no more than that this highly-favoured woman should, for the sake of her future offspring, be the object of the special protection and care of God;—should dwell, as the Psalmist expresses it, under the shadow of the Almighty, and be under the care and guidance of his good spirit, of his gracious Providence. And he thinks that the remarkable events which accompanied the birth of Jesus, could not but have a most powerful influence on her who laid these things up in her heart, in the nurture and training of this heir of promise, and also on his own mind, as they were in process of time related to him, while he gradually increased in wisdom and in stature, and in favour both with God and man. The author proceeds to enlarge on this suggestion, and indulge his imagination in following it out into particulars. We cannot make room for the whole, but are unwilling to abridge the following passage.

"It is not unnatural for a moment to wish that we possessed the history, in detail, of the period which this beloved son of the Most High God spent in privacy, before the time when his kinsman John came forth from *his* solitary abode in the wilderness of Judæa, to preach the baptism of repentance, and to announce the approach of the Messiah. We do know enough to make us feel assured, that the same disposition of soul which he manifested, when, sanctified by the anointing of the Spirit, he was sent into the world by his heavenly Father, had been that by which he had been led through the preceding years from the earliest period of infancy. Of him, without a doubt, it might *always* be said, as well as in the days of his ministry, that 'he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.' We know that 'the child grew and waxed strong in the Spirit, filled with wisdom,' and that 'the grace of God was upon him.' We know that at twelve years of age, still subject to his parents, and engaged without a doubt in the ordinary occupations of life, he showed understanding and sagacity in the subjects of religion, which enabled him to converse with the teachers of the law, so as to

astonish all who heard him; and we have the comprehensive declaration, that he 'increased in wisdom and in stature, and in favour both with God and man.'

"But we know something more than this, even in addition to what had taken place before and after his birth, contributing to the sanctity of his life, and his preparedness for the great work before him. We know the nature of those public services of religion in which without a doubt he habitually joined; not only of those solemn rites which accompanied the three great festivals of his nation, but those of the frequent stated worship of the synagogues, by which we know what were the supplications and thanksgivings which he offered to Jehovah, the God of his fathers. And we have, too, those holy Scriptures by which he was instructed and guided, by which his pious affections were cherished, by which the fear and the love of Jehovah his God were impressed upon his spirit, and made the regulating spring of his life. But to discern the extraordinary influences of these, as he increased in wisdom, on his understanding,—on his heart,—on his pure and lovely sensibilities,—on his elevated but regulated imagination,—on his faith in God, and in the purposes and discipline of his soul,—we must remember that he knew from the dawn of life that that life was to be destined to great and momentous purposes. He would learn, as he could receive it, that he was to sit on the throne of his father David, and to possess a kingdom of which there should be no end,—that he was to be a light to enlighten the Gentiles, and the glory of his people Israel;—but nevertheless that he was to be the object of cruel contradiction,—and that his mother's heart would on his account be pierced through with many sorrows. And how, with such thoughts, would he, in the retired glens which surrounded Nazareth,—in the sacred solitudes where he had no witness but his heavenly Father,—dwell in deep contemplation on the prophecies which respect the Anointed of Jehovah, which he was at the appointed, but uncertain, time himself to become. We know that he would discern, in that sacred volume which trains up the spirit to godliness now, as it did in the days of Christ, as it did Jesus himself, that the Messiah (and such he knew he was to be) was specially designed to be the herald of divine mercy to the children of sin and ignorance, to bind up the broken-hearted, to offer liberty to the captive, to open the prison doors to those in bonds, and to proclaim the acceptable year of Jehovah, the year of the spiritual jubilee. He saw that he was one day to have a dominion which should include all nations, and all ages; a kingdom that time and death should not destroy. But he also saw that the Messiah was to be a man of sorrows and acquainted with griefs; to be despised and neglected of men; to be cut off, but not for himself; to be wounded for the transgressions of his people; to be bruised and put to grief, and at last to die with the wicked.

"It requires but little exercise of the imagination, and but little knowledge of the heart, to discern how such contemplations must have influenced and trained this beloved son and servant of the Most High. And then think of him as passing ten years of manhood thus looking forward,—knowing that the time was appointed, but without a knowledge

of the time—often appearing to discern in the distant horizon the streaks of approaching dawn, and then finding the day-star of expectation entirely hidden,—constantly discharging present duties, and preparing for those to come,—walking perhaps sometimes in darkness, but always trusting in the name of Jehovah, and staying his soul on God, his God; —doubtless acknowledging Him in all his ways, and secretly directed (as all are who acknowledge Him faithfully) by the unseen hand, which more obviously guided his fathers in the desert by a pillar of cloud in the day, and by a pillar of fire in the night:—growing up before Jehovah as a tender plant, without attracting the observation of men;—never himself failing or being discouraged, because the day of summons to public duty came not;—but, as the finger of Providence directed him, supporting the bruised reed, and supplying the expiring lamp;—and always watching with unwavering faith for the fulfilment of God's promises, in the way, and at the time, which Infinite wisdom deemed best.

"It must have been under the influence of such views, that our great poet, near the beginning of the Paradise Regained, thus speaks of the beloved Son of God,—when in the desert, after his high appointment was announced to him,—as retracing his holy life:—

> 'When I was yet a child, no childish play
> To me was pleasing; all my mind was set
> Serious to learn and know, and thence to do,
> What might be public good. Myself I thought
> Born to that end, born to promote all truth,
> All righteous things; therefore above my years
> The law of God I read, and found it sweet,
> Made it my whole delight, and in it grew
> Unto perfection.'"

We might have pleasure in referring to many other discourses in this volume which would serve to illustrate the character and peculiar talents of the author, and suggest useful and interesting trains of thought;—but we forbear. Our object will have been answered, if as many as possible of our readers should enable themselves to derive from a careful perusal of the sermons themselves the moral and spiritual benefit which we are sure they are well fitted to communicate.

We ought not to conclude without adverting to the promised Memoir, which we understand is in preparation, and which, if judiciously drawn up, cannot fail, we should think, of forming an acceptable addition to the treasures of Unitarian Biography.

T.

## Art. VI.—PARADISE AFTER THE FALL.

After our first parents had left the garden of Eden, having forfeited by disobedience their earthly Paradise, and their state of immortal innocence, a beautiful band of sisters were placed there, that its flowers might not blossom in vain, that some living forms might delight in the lovely creation.

The tree of knowledge stood in the midst no longer; the new race of innocent and joyous beings were to be free from Eve's fatal temptation; but where its roots had once been fixed, now yawned an awful chasm, deep, dark, and incomprehensible.

The Almighty no longer manifested himself in Paradise. The most High had drawn before Him the veil of His perfections. To the weakened eyes of mortals the Creator had become invisible, and though His fatherly hand was over the sisters, they knew it not.

Stretched upon a mossy turf lay the three beautiful forms whose limbs had never yet tried their power, whose consciousness had yet to come unto them. The trees gently waved over their heads,—the rising sun threw its uncertain rays amidst the branches,—and the varying light danced on the sleeping sisters. The birds twittered upon the boughs, and carolled their morning hymn. Life came upon these children of God, and their eyes were opened to the beauties of created things. They sprang up together from their resting place, they gazed upon each other smilingly, and they bounded with elasticity of motion, and freshness of spirit, along the glades of the Paradise which opened before them. With unsated senses they once more met together; their hearts beat high with their inward bliss; their lips unbidden opened, and they participated their delight. Again and again they examined the beauties of the garden; they paused to taste of the varied fruits; they turned their eyes to the glorious sun and the bright sky above them, and again and again they re-echoed one another's voices, till exhausted as evening approached, they embracing sunk to repose.

The earliest ray of morning brought Celestina once more to a sense of being. Her eyes opened upon her sisters, who in placid slumbers lay beside her, half concealed by the luxuriant herbage which afforded their chance place of rest. Celestina's first sensation was of past happiness; her first impulse was with kisses of affection to arouse her companions.

Once more they ranged around their paradise with untired,

unabated delight; once more, as the sun departed, the night-breeze lulled them to repose.

Celestina again woke first, but now she suffered her sisters to sleep on; light had begun to dawn upon her mind, and her thoughts were busy within her breast. "How beautiful, how wonderful!" she mentally exclaimed; "how delightful is every thing around me! How strange that I have but just begun to know of these things!" She paused,—she surveyed herself,—her eyes wandered inquiringly around; she felt she had consciousness, she was beginning to reflect. "How did I first come hither?" she asked herself; "whence has my life begun, or how is it that I cannot remember that I have always lived?"

Her innocent countenance was for the first time beclouded with a sense of imperfection, and the tear stood in her eye, though she understood not its meaning. With a heart less buoyant, and a slower step than before had been Celestina's, she arose and entered a thicket. She explored its recesses, she broke through the close-woven foliage for the first time; she approached the place where the tree of knowledge had stood; she started from the brink of the chasm. She surveyed it with fixed eye; she walked around it; she stooped to examine the fearful abyss. Nothing resisted her snowy arm as she moved it backwards and forwards in the dark opening. Celestina felt within her an assurance of danger; she shuddered; she retreated. In the gayer parts of the garden she found her sisters dancing with light hearts in the pleasant sunbeams. With laughing eyes they entwined their arms with hers, and their waving locks floated on the balmy atmosphere as they chased the butterflies from flower to flower. Bright joy was once more on the brow of Celestina; her solitary walk and her meditations were forgotten.

And so did days, and weeks, and months pass, and the sisters' love never diminished, and their sportive innocence was undecayed. Yet sometimes Celestina's smile would vanish, and sometimes did she, who alone knew of its existence, with an awed spirit visit the chasm; and sometimes did she experience an inward sinking, as though her heart had want of being filled. Yet she knew not what it was that could make her happier; she only perceived she was less joyous than her sisters. And she *was* happy; for her Creator ever watched over her for good, and his blessed spirit was with her, though she could not discern it.

It was towards the close of a beautiful day: the sisters were sporting together, and had hid themselves by turns in the deep shades. Two were now seeking through the groves and bowers;

it was the gayest, the fairest, that was missing. Celestina and her companion entered the thicket whose entangled passes led to the chasm. To penetrate this dark region had till now been shunned by all save the dark-eyed maiden; her light-hearted playmates had more loved the sun and the flowers. But at length did the three sisters meet by the yawning gulf, and its existence was no longer a secret in the bosom of Celestina. Still danger was a feeling unknown except to her, and she saw it, and trembling held back her companion. And now the wanderer ran around the chasm in playful giddiness, and her airy footsteps passed unheeding by her sisters. With graceful speed she trod around the verge; with elastic bound she crossed the deep abyss; with eager haste she dared a second leap. Her strength was gone, and silently like lightning she fell. The dark gulf was there, but that pure being had fled! Her companions gazed fearfully and in mute wonder. They would have rushed after their lost sister, but they felt an unknown power restraining them, and they heard a voice as from heaven, which said, "Fear not, little ones, it is your Father's good pleasure."

Celestina moved not as she lay upon the turf supporting with her arm her innocent sister, who trembling in terror clung to the only being she could look to for protection. That feeble guardian, pale and speechless, had raised her eyes to the blue heavens, which seemed to rest on the surrounding thicket. Aching doubts, deep agony had oppressed her as she sank upon the ground, but the awful voice which in solemnly sweet accents had swept through the air, had filled her spirit with a deep, and till then unfelt delight. The secret aspirations of her soul to the hidden cause of her being, the desires of a grateful and adoring heart for some object to serve and love, were now for the first time answered; for the first time it had been revealed to her that she had a Father, and her heart taught her all that was implied in that blessed word.

The sun was declining ere the bereft sisters had spoken to each other. Its rays passed unbending across the topmost boughs of the dark grove, and the shades of the awful chasm were deepened. Celestina embraced her reviving sister, and rose to lead her to their bower. She tried to impart her feelings and hopes to her who till now had found a sufficiency of joy in the mere act of being; who till now had thought not whence she came or whither she must return. Bewildered with the bursting sense of hitherto unimagined things, this feeble child of humanity sunk to a sweet forgetfulness of sorrow. Celestina watched her until sleep had laid its soothing influences upon her, and then, in the calmness of the night air, she sought

relief to her overpowered thoughts. This beautiful being, with spirit moulded for a higher state than that of uninformed innocence, sat upon a mossy bank, and wept. These tears, the first that she had ever shed, were the tribute mortality must pay before it can comprehend the joys of heaven. And now she raised her eyes, and immediately the blood ran thrilling through her veins. Night had before never found her sleepless,—the sun alone had been her guiding light; but now she saw the glories of the firmament; she gazed on the universe of worlds!

The voice she had heard was deep in Celestina's thoughts; a mingled and scarce-comprehended sensation of gratitude, awe, and veneration, spread over her soul, and this prayer was at her heart, though she hardly perceived it: "Oh Thou, who broughtest me into being, and who canst take me away from this sweet paradise, oh! teach me who Thou art!" Again did she cry bitterly, for a grievous weight oppressed her spirit. A second time did a voice come over her, "The Lord who made all things is good to all, and His tender mercies are over all His works. The Lord upholdeth them that fall, and to Him shall all flesh come. The Lord is thy Father, and is ever with thee, and thou shalt love and serve and obey thy Creator and thy God."

Celestina lay as one lifeless on the earth's cold bosom, but her spirit was worshipping in the presence of her Maker. Fervent and unutterable were her grateful aspirations, long and deep her inward communions. She viewed the sunrise with glowing sensations; the day-spring from on high had dawned on her understanding. She sought for her sister with slow and serious steps, but her heart was joyous; it had been filled from the eternal and unfailing fountain.

With tearful embraces the former playmates met, who were henceforth to know a deeper and closer friendship. Celestina joined in mourning their sister's departure; it was her blessed task afterwards to impart the balm of consolation. "She was but gone home to their gracious Father, their everlasting friend; she was safe and happy in his merciful keeping; her bright fair spirit should never know sorrow, and her smile would welcome them when they also were summoned."

And now did the sisters roam around their paradise, whilst heart to heart they grew together. Celestina instructed and cheered the gentle being who, in humble faith, prayed with her to her God.

No more was giddy sportiveness and careless mirth to be seen amidst the sunny bowers. The gayest of the band was gone, and the thought of such joys was sorrowful. And one

was left that shed many tears o'er the past, and wept for the sister who had twined the wreaths of flowers, who had danced in fairy rings, who had lightly skipped through the garlands, singing more sweetly than the birds, but who now was vanished. She wept,—but she was blessed; for there was spread over her spirit the love of her Maker.

The garden once more heard the praises of His name. The sisters could glorify Him in the works of His hand. They traced His goodness in the beauties of Paradise. Each insect, each flower, showed His wisdom and might. New zest was given to the actions of the sisters, and they felt they could worship the Almighty for ever.

Celestina had lost her uneasy doubts, her deep melancholy feelings. With pure humility she bowed before Infinite Perfection; with unvarying hope she leaned on the word of the Most High; with fervent constancy her soul aspired to the blessed period when her Father should call her to His presence, and she should be satisfied with His likeness.

The months passed away, and it might have been thought that two angels walked in Paradise. At length their Father was pleased to summon them from their distant resting-place. He guided their steps to the brink of the chasm; they heard the heavenly command to enter that untried passage—the passage from Time to Eternity. Celestina held the hand of her sister. Fear was lost in Hope. In unshaken faith these children of God smiled on each other, and sank into the gulf, now terrible and mysterious no longer, and they were no more on earth;—they were in Heaven.

# INTELLIGENCE.

A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE CHURCH OF GOD KNOWN AS FREE-THINKING CHRISTIANS: ALSO, AN ABSTRACT OF THE PRINCIPLES WHICH THEY BELIEVE, AND THE LAWS OF CHURCH FELLOWSHIP THEY HAVE ADOPTED.

The first members of this Church were part of the congregation of Mr. Winchester, the celebrated advocate of the doctrine of the "Universal Restoration;" but it was during the ministry of his successor, Mr. Vidler, that they were led to deny the doctrine of the Trinity, and the correctness of having paid or exclusive teachers in the Church. This produced a separation, and those who seceded held their first meetings in the year 1798.

The object which these seceders proposed to themselves, as stated in a declaration published at the time, was, "to make the conduct and example of the first Christians, so far as they followed the commands of Jesus Christ and his apostles, their only rule." In furtherance of this object they held many meetings, which they devoted to the reading and examination of the new Testament, "for the purpose," as they leave on record, "of collecting and arranging the laws, form of government, discipline, and essential principles of the Church of God, as set forth by the apostles of Christ."

The result of these meetings was, that on the 24th day of March 1799, a special meeting was held, at which, "after solemn preparation and prayer," those present resolved themselves into a Church, elected an elder and deacons, and agreed upon the place and times of meeting, and the religious exercises in which they should in future engage. In the following year they published a book, entitled, "*The true design of the Church of God, and the government thereof, exhibited by a succession of laws founded upon the authority of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, faithfully extracted from the New Testament. Published for the Church meeting in Old Change, London,* 1800."

The name first chosen by this Church, to distinguish themselves from the rest of the religious world, was, Humble Enquirers after Truth; they afterwards adopted that of Free-Thinking Christians. This latter name was chosen to imply at once their conviction that the free exercise of reason is essential to a correct understanding and appreciation of divine truth, and their belief in Jesus Christ, as the messenger of God. But as a Church founded solely upon the laws and authority of the scriptures, they consider their proper and scriptural designation to be Church of God.

The foregoing statement will show the esteem in which the members of this Church have ever held those great principles, emphatically called

Protestant,—the right of private judgment, and the sufficiency of the Scriptures. In accordance with these principles they maintain the utmost freedom of inquiry and freedom of speech in their religious association ; and they feel bound to reject, as contrary to the will of God, any doctrine concerning religion, whether of faith or practice, which does not agree with the Scriptures correctly interpreted. To the question, who is to judge concerning religious doctrine and scripture interpretation ? they reply—every man, individually and for himself, not as a right merely, but as a most imperative duty. It is impossible one man can be another's substitute in matters of religion, or that the responsibility attached to the duty of individual judgment can be evaded.

In submitting the following statement, the formation of a creed or of articles of faith is not intended. Any such attempt would be in evident contradiction to the principles just stated. Neither do this Church profess to advance new truths—for those things cannot be new which the Scriptures taught so many ages since—nor yet, strange and unheard-of opinions concerning revealed religion, for they hold no opinion which may not be found amongst one or other of the Churches of the religious world, either as cherished truths or as distinguishing principles : but what follows is presented as an abstract of the views of revealed truth, both in religious doctrine and church organization, to which the members of this Church have been led. They have long possessed these views, they prize them highly, and, desiring their furtherance, submit them to the consideration of others.

There is one God, and only one, the sole Creator and sovereign disposer of all things, material and spiritual,—the Jehovah of the Old Testament, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

God revealed his being and his will to the first families of the earth, providing thus for the moral and religious necessities of his rational creatures, as he had already provided for the physical wants and necessities of all creation.

Abraham and his posterity were, subsequently, chosen to be the depositaries of revealed truth, and the Jewish people were instituted the people and the Church of God, Moses and the prophets promulgating and enforcing the law of God. But, perfect as this dispensation was, in respect of the objects proposed, and the circumstances of its recipients, it always pointed to a more perfect dispensation when the Messiah should come, and the gospel should be proclaimed, first to the Jews, and afterwards to all the nations of the earth.

Jesus of Nazareth was that Messiah—that son of God—that beloved Son, concerning whom the heavens declared, " hear ye him,"—a man, not a supernal being. To do good and to teach the truths of religion in simplicity and perfection, were his meat and his drink. The love of God, and love or benevolence towards mankind, were declared, by him, to be the sum of all religion ; he denounced that profession of religion which consists in mere faith or apparent sanctity, without fruits ; he taught that the true worshippers should worship God in spirit and in truth ; he taught the forgiveness of sins upon repentance ; the resurrection of the dead ; and the future righteous judgment of all mankind.

This same Jesus suffered death at the hands of the Jewish people, and was raised from the dead by the mighty power of God—the reward of his own perfect obedience, and the certain confirmation of the truth of every thing which he had taught.

After his resurrection from the dead, he was with his apostles many days, and fully instructed them in all things pertaining to his kingdom. He commanded them to preach the glad tidings of this kingdom to all nations of the earth, beginning at Jerusalem; for this great work they were endued with power from on high, and in obeying this command their lives were spent.

The labours of the apostles were realized in a two-fold result,—the conversion of unbelievers; and the establishment of the Church of God under Jesus Christ, as the head and chief of a new dispensation. Neither of these objects was attained without the accomplishment of the other, and, therefore, in whatever city or place their testimony was received, all who believed were united together, and organized as assemblies, or parts of the Church of God, and these churches now became the depositaries of the truths of divine revelation, and occupied that place in the dispensations of Providence which had been previously occupied by the descendants of Abraham, and the Church under Moses.

The Church of God is thus a continuous institution, and one and the same Church in all ages. Unity is its distinguishing feature. All who complied with the conditions which the messengers of God required, were united with those of like faith; and, whatever assembly obeyed the laws of God, without any admixture of human authority, however separated by time or place, were parts of his Church.

Under this new dispensation, of which Jesus and the apostles were the agents, the distinction of Jew and Gentile, slave and freeman, man and woman, secures no peculiar or spiritual privileges in the sight of God, or in his Church; descent from Abraham, and national consanguinity, are overruled by the relationship and brotherhood of a common faith, and common obedience to one Lord and master. Equality, therefore, is the condition of members of the Church of God.

In order to become a member of the Church of God, the apostles required those who believed in Jesus to repent of their past sins, and resolve in future to obey the revealed will of God. As the messengers of God, they proposed no other conditions; and those who complied with these conditions, are declared to have received justification, that is, forgiveness from God of all past sin; to be accepted by him, that is, received into his Church; and to be his elect, that is, chosen by him for a life of religion and holiness. These are the only scriptural doctrines of salvation, justification, and election.

To this Church, the apostles prescribed the form of Church government under which it should exist; the mode of religious improvement and instruction which it should adopt; and the nature and kind of religious worship which, as a Church, it should render to God.

The form of government or Church Establishment, instituted by the apostles, was as simple as it was perfect. It consisted of elders, that is, overseers; of deacons, that is, servants; and of messengers.

An elder was ordained in each assembly of the Church of God, not as a lord over God's heritage—not for the purpose of personal gain, or as a means of livelihood, or for worldly influence—neither as constrained to an irksome duty,—but as a brother among brethren, to preserve the order of the meetings, and, by example and precept, induce and secure a willing obedience to the laws of God. Deacons were appointed, either as aids to the elder, or when any affairs were to be transacted, to which the whole body could not attend; and messengers were chosen when it was necessary, to communicate, personally, with distant churches. Such is the Church Establishment of the New Testament. All that system of spiritual domination, which has exercised, and still exercises, so much influence in the Christian world, is wholly, and *avowedly*, without the authority of the apostles of Jesus: and though essential for the support and influence of a class, is utterly subversive of the rights of believers, and the constitution of the Church God.

The method of religious instruction, and means of increase in the knowledge of religious truth, established by the apostles in the Church of God, consisted, mainly, in private converse, and mutual admonition and exhortation; but, when assembled in one place, as a Church, the speakers were to speak two or three, and the rest to judge. Paid or exclusive teachers, under any name or guise, were unheard of;—the distinction of clergy and laity, priest and people, was unknown; no such orders or distinctions existed in the apostolic Churches, nor can they now exist in the Church without the entire destruction of those principles upon which it was founded.

The religious worship commanded by Jesus, and instituted by his apostles, in the Church of God, under the gospel dispensation, was equally consistent with the attributes of the divine Being, and the rational nature of his offspring. It consists in obedience to God, uninfluenced by temporary considerations; in faithfulness to the commands of Jesus, however tempted to swerve from them; in care and disinterested labour for the preservation of the principles and the purity of the Church, purchased by the sufferings and sacrifices of the holy servants of God; in benevolence, forbearance, meekness, integrity; in an open profession of the truth, and conduct emanating from faith in the promises of God;—such is the worship, and such are the spiritual sacrifices which the Church of God are continually to offer up. But public social prayers, Sabbaths, holy days, and all other forms and ceremonies, are devoid of sanction from the New Testament. All authorized rites and ceremonies ceased with the Jewish temple worship.

To the Church thus established, all the promises of God, and all the exhortations of the apostles to believers, are addressed, either to that Church as a whole, or to the assemblies or individuals who are part of that whole. To be united with this Church must have been the highest privilege, and the first duty of every one who believed in Jesus Christ as the Son of God; for the existence of an independent, or isolated believer, or of a class of persons accepting revealed religion, and yet not united with others of like faith, is, in no one case, contemplated. The religion of Jesus, as expounded by himself and his apostles, is not, as a

whole, either applicable or practicable under any other circumstance than that of Church fellowship.

Such is the religion of Jesus Christ, according to the New Testament, and such are the characteristic and essential principles of the Church of God, as established by divinely-appointed messengers. To become a Church of God, one only and obvious means exists, or ever did, or could exist,—acceptance of the conditions propounded by God through his messengers. These conditions can be learned nowhere but in the New Testament. He who prescribed these conditions alone can change or modify them,—no such power exists on earth; apostolical descent is a fiction, the spiritual authority claimed by hierarchies, priests, or their agents, mere assumption. If in the days of the apostles any Church, which set aside the commands of God, as inconvenient or inexpedient, or which adopted any invention of man as a religious duty, ceased to be of the Church of God, so must it be in the present time. The blessings of the gospel can be received only by complying with the conditions of the gospel, and the advantages of revelation realized only in the proportions in which its truths and principles are correctly understood and faithfully applied.

Notice.—*The Public Meetings of this Church are held every Sunday morning, at Eleven o'clock, in their Meeting-house, St. John's Square, Clerkenwell.—The elder will be at all times happy to give further information to those who may desire it.*

---

NEWINGTON-GREEN CHAPEL.

Another monument to departed worth, exciting feelings not less agreeable than that recently erected to Mrs. Barbauld, has been placed in this Chapel. It is to the late eminent Dr. Price, a man who occupied much attention in his day; and whose pulpit labours were of sterling value, though unsurpassed in modesty, both at Newington Green and at Hackney. Not *many* such men, perhaps, have toiled in our cause: but we could wish the practice more frequent in our chapels, of thus honouring by-gone ministers, even though they should not have acquired all the literary, scientific, and professional notoriety of Dr. Price. The monument in question is both chaste and handsome: consisting of a white marble tablet on a black ground, and surmounted by an elegantly draped vase. The inscription, from the pen of the Rev. Thomas Cromwell, F.S.A., the present minister, is as follows:—

To the Memory of
Richard Price, D.D., F.R.S.,
Twenty-six years Minister of this Chapel:
Born at Tynton, Glamorganshire, February 23rd, 1723;
Died at Hackney, Middlesex, April 19th, 1791.
Theologian, Philosopher, Mathematician;
Friend to Freedom as to Virtue;

Brother of Man;
Lover of Truth as of God;
His Eminent Talents were matched by his Integrity,
Simplicity, and Goodness of Heart;
His Moral Dignity by his Profound Humility.

Few have been more useful in their generation,
Or more valued by the wise and good;
None more pure and disinterested.
Honoured be his Name!
Imitated his Example!

---

### ACADEMICAL HONOR.

(*From a Correspondent.*)

The University of Giessen in Germany has conferred the title of Doctor in Divinity on the Rev. J. R. Beard, of Manchester, on account of his theological writings. This seat of learning has about four hundred Students, is in the capital of the Grand Duchy of Hesse, and may be recognised by some of our readers as the place in which Kuinoel, the author of the commentary on the historical books of the New Testament (which many Unitarians are accustomed to use), is engaged in teaching Theology. Dr. Credner, the Dean of the Theological Faculty, is translating into German a publication of Mr. Beard's on Methodism, originally published anonymously by the Unitarian Association.

THE

# CHRISTIAN TEACHER.

---

ART. I.—VIVIA PERPETUA; a Dramatic Poem. By SARAH FLOWER ADAMS. 12mo, pp. 200. London: Charles Fox.

IN a late number of this Periodical we gave the historical account of the martyrdom of Vivia Perpetua, as it is related in Milman's History of Christianity. The tale itself is a poem of the deepest power and beauty, and we cannot say that even as poetry, the Drama supersedes the History. We say this in no spirit of depreciation of the volume before us, but because in the simple and unencumbered narrative of the Historian, there is a directness, a reality, an absence of unnecessary and confusing accessories,—and the Martyr is brought before us with a distinctness that leaves an image in the soul, which is itself the highest poetry, the purest ideal. We are not sure that the subject is at all fitted for dramatic poetry. It admits of no plot that would not spoil and dim the single interest of the holy faith and courage, the divine strength in woman's weakness, which is the soul and spiritual essence that shines through and glorifies the horrors of the martyr's death. The struggles indeed between the inward sentiment of faith and duty, and the conflicting affections which rend the bosom of the daughter and the mother, and, for a moment, counsel concealment and disloyalty to Christ, afford the genuine materials for dramatic effect,—but this, which is really the only dramatic feature in the poem, occupies but an inconsiderable portion of its contents,—and by a great error, as we think, in the conception of the piece, we feel so little interest in the character of Perpetua's father, and indeed despise him so heartily, that we can scarcely sympathize with the struggle of affections in the daughter's bosom. Had Vivius been truly a "noble Roman," as he is outwardly styled

in the *Dramatis Personæ*, one bound in loyalty and devotion of soul to the "Antient Gods," whose piety and patriotism, long blended into one sentiment, would have made *him* too a willing martyr to his highest faith,—had he been a father with a father's heart, with his love for Perpetua unstained by selfishness and ambition,—had the bonds between them been those of the immortal affections, a child's veneration and a father's unsearchable tenderness,—then would our sympathies with both have engaged us too in the struggle between nature and conscience, and instead of the reader's indifference and contempt, we should have felt towards Vivius with the daughter's distracted heart. Such a character too, reflecting the noblest lights of the old religion, would have brought Christianity into fair contrast with Heathenism, and shown its superior inspirations of strength as of tenderness,—that the love of Christ dared more than the Stoic temper, and that the power to suffer for Christ's sake and the Gospel's was the strongest in the gentlest breast. As the Poem now stands, there is not one representative of Heathenism in whom we feel the slightest interest; for Cæcilius and Attilius have faith in nothing, and represent merely the kind affections which Nature implants in Jew, Gentile, and Christian. Christianity does not need such partial contrasts. It should have been brought into comparison with the purest and noblest form of the old Faith.

The subject of the Poem, however, though not eminently dramatic, is one calculated to afford scope for the introduction of the highest sentiments of our nature, ennobled and elevated into a divine energy by Christian faith,—and the author has availed herself with much power of these capabilities of her subject. Perpetua is brought before us, too much so indeed for dramatic effect, in the strength of perfected faith and resolution, and with the traces only of past conflict and suffering. Thus the terrors of the martyrdom which awaits her, and here the author has brought in the highest spirit of her art, make less impression upon our sympathy than the unblenching firmness and trusting quiet of soul, with which she drinks of the cup her Master drank of, and passes through the baptism he was baptized with. Her father is proud, ambitious, insolent, and selfish: his very love has interested objects. We learn from his own lips that he had compelled his daughter to submit to a marriage, to gratify his pride, at the expense of her peace and happiness. She had endured much, and in this martyrdom of her dearest affections, suffering some of life's bitterest griefs, and experiencing the utter insufficiency of her religion to bring comfort and support to her weary and heavy-laden spirit, we see that she

would be the more easily led to embrace the consolations of Christ. Her husband is dead, and she is left with one child. She conceals from her father her conversion to Christianity. The discovery is made by Barac, a Jew, a sort of Shylock, who hates the Christians, and for some wrong or insult hates Vivius with even more than his Christian hatred,—and takes a fiendish delight in torturing him with dark intimations of the terrible secret.

> " Those vipers that you hate—those Christian vipers—
> Have crawl'd over the threshold of your house;
> Those creeping waters sap your mansion walls;
> Those wily birds do roost within your gardens.
> Glare on; the proof I have—the proof I use;
> Or give your gold even to such as I."

Perpetua joins the Christians in their secret worship, and this Barac makes known the fact to Hilarianus the Præfect, and offers to conduct him to the cave where the worshippers are privately assembled. This Præfect is an indolent and sensual, but not cruel man, and Vivius, professing great indignation at his leniency towards the Christians, entertains ambitious projects to displace him. Nothing, however, affecting the fate of Perpetua, or the development of the drama, arises out of this disposition of characters and passions.

The first introduction of Perpetua is perhaps conceived more truly in the dramatic spirit than any other passage in the poem. A conflict of internal feelings is indicated, and expectation forcibly excited.

> " Vivia, *alone.*
> It cannot be, that I, whose heart was wont
> To live upon my lips like any child's,
> Should now begin a life externe, untrue,
> Now that this great Reality hath come
> To wake renewing life within, that gives
> A fuller impulse to my every thought—
> A growth so sensible that days seem years
> To pass me onward. Yesterday, scarce woman,
> Weak, poor, unknowing God, save in my fear—
> Today, a soul adoring Him with love.
> Yet what to do? This silence grows too great;
> Hath it not even now press'd on the sense
> To find a speech in phantoms? Fearful, too,
> My father's face between me and my child!
> The never-failing sweetest peace, that once
> Would sit and watch in fellowship with me

Beside his rosy sleep, hath vanish'd all
Before that pallid shadow! Whence?—O Heaven!
Is it thy mute reproach unto my silence?
To break it—how? To say unto my father,
I am a Christian! Oh, 'twere easier far
To speak those words unto assembled Carthage
Than one should even raise a doubt in him!
I cannot, while he stands full in the sun,
A child for hopefulness, a man for strength,
I cannot play the tempest to his joy,
And smite him to the earth."—p. 19.

In the main part of the poem, and "in the development of character and motive," as the author expressly intimates, dramatic effect has been made a secondary object. Perpetua is unreal in her calmness. She is raised above the passionate emotions, the subduing tenderness of our nature, and a sense of coldness, of something statue-like in the effect, is left upon the admiring but unsympathizing mind. Neither is this compensated for by a rich flow of verse. In the style there is strength and simplicity, and it is so delightful to meet with this that we advert with reluctance to the inharmonious effect of the constant occurrence of the ellipsis, and the serious liberties with our language which occasionally obscure the meaning, and cannot be considered consistent with strict correctness, either grammatical or lexicographal.

We must enter our protest against such easy negligence as the conversion of "apart" into a noun-substantive, and the faulty ellipsis in the last line.

"Yon niche, where an apart was sought, alone
From crowds that own'd no reverence for him
They nam'd their God—is still the God they name!"—p. 50.

In the same passionate address to Jupiter Olympus we have the following negligences of a similar kind.

"Jove! give back—
Give back those tears were shed in vain to thee;
Give back those trembling vows were made to thee;
Give back the sacrifice was paid to thee,—
That I may render all to that dear God
Hath freed me from those agonies of fear
Thou reckonest for worship."

We cannot be guilty of the injustice of stopping our quotation where our censure ends, and withholding the beautiful passage

that follows,—even though with some awkwardness we shall have to return to our interrupted criticisms.

> " Oh! to him
> Vows upward rise like springing flowers, from whom
> Sweet mercy first hath dropp'd the precious seed;
> And sacrifice, that ceaseth, while it maketh,
> So much of love doth mingle with the deed;
> And blessed pray'r, that wings the trusting soul
> At once into the heaven where He dwells;
> And while we hallow his almighty name,
> Doth teach us say, Our Father. Hear me now;
> Hear, thou great God of love; hear blessed Christ!
> Ye, dwelling not in temples made with hands,
> Up in the eternal greatness of the heav'ns—
> Bear witness, all ye myriads of angels,
> That, like to radiant stars, cluster in heav'n;
> Thus, on my knees,—thus—thus, before the Lord,
> I solemn vow,—record it, all ye hosts,—
> Never again to come within this temple,
> Whate'er the penalty,—or death to me,
> Or agony—worse death—to those I love.
> Upon my head so let it come, O God!"

We go back ungracefully to our unexhausted instances of unallowable ellipsis.

> " Ay, you may jest; 'tis none."—p. 3.

The selfish and ambitious father speaks thus of the power of Perpetua to aid his projects:

> " For Vivia, mark!
> Beneath the gentleness that you call child,
> There is a depth, nor you nor I can sound.
> Thus much can I; to know there haunts the power
> Shall aid the hopes stretch o'er yon heaving sea,
> E'en to the Tiber's mouth."—p. 16.

The last defect of this nature we are about to cite, we find surrounded by such beauty that we extract the whole passage, and we shall rejoice if our criticism is utterly forgotten and lost in the excitement of higher and better sentiments.

> " O love, that shone so bright o'er all the world,
> That every man seem'd image of a God!
> He dwelleth not in temples made with hands;
> The temples of the living Lord are ye;

His kingdom is within you. Thus for me,
From that time forth, did every human form
Stand for a living shrine of deity.
How dark soe'er, no fire upon the altar,
Still was it man—man capable of God!
Each blacken'd criminal for me became
A hope towards an angel; for I felt
The meanest slave or birth or crime doth own
Is yet a brother *unto him was lift*,
By promise of the Lord of life and light,
Up to a paradise from off a cross!
O grand redemption—true equality—
Beheld in Christian love! Nor least nor greatest;
Master and slave, rich, poor, all come alike,
Blest by redeeming love, into heav'n's kingdom."—p. 63.

There is an occasional tendency in our author to yield to the temptation of what is called fine writing. This consists chiefly in the use of glittering and imposing, but unmeaning and inappropriate figures. In the following passage Christ is not exalted, but lowered, when he is called "the immortal Poet of Humanity." Such an expression infallibly suggests ideas and comparisons of the most inappropriate kind,—and to our feeling there is a levity in the term which the sacredness of Christian sentiment rejects.—Though his character was the divinest of creations, yet in no sense can we call Christ a Poet, except as we might call God a Poet, and by so doing offend all right feeling. Nothing again can be more hard and material, glittering but unmeaning, than the comparison of Christ's mind to a stylus, a dead instrument for tracing impressions on dead substances,—and to a classical reader who has but one idea of a stylus, it must be "confusion worse confounded" to have to think of it as "diamonded with light." Yet we have seen this very faulty passage quoted with high praise.

"Bow down to him, a mightier one than all,
The immortal Poet of Humanity!
Whose mind, a stylus diamonded with light,
Illumes the while it graves its radiant truths
Upon the fleshly tables of the heart."—p. 65.

But we gladly turn to the more gracious office of presenting to our readers some of the many beauties of this poem. Saturus is the Christian instructor of Perpetua,—and here is their first meeting in the drama. Vivia had been communing with her divided heart, on her child, her duty and her death,—when

" *Enter* SATURUS.

SATURUS.
Peace be within this house!

VIVIA.
Now all is well.

SATURUS.
Peace, even in death?—You thought of Him
Whose legacy was 'peace' even in death;
Whose first immortal blessing on the Twelve,
When he had overcome the conqueror,
Was, 'peace be unto you!'—You thought of Him:
Why are you silent?

VIVIA.
Under thy rebuke,
Which mine own conscience sharpens to rebuke,
Not thy intent; myself and mine own sorrow
Usurp'd the place of Him thou wilt restore.

SATURUS.
Lives there a sorrow that Christ cannot heal?
Nay, sorrow dies; and dying, she bequeaths
A rich endowment for a noble joy;
Dissolves in light, to bid us hold her tears
As precious dews that visit us from heav'n,
To nurture up the soul to richer growth;
Our light afflictions are but for a moment:
Is there a sorrow that Christ cannot heal?"—p. 55.

We know not that the power of Faith to live a life of peace, and to look into the heart of things for the hidden workings of the love of God, has ever been more truly stated than in the following passage. We are aware that a more sparing use of the Fancy would have given to it more of depth and power.

" VIVIA.
There is a thought—say, would it be a sin
To track a mystery?

SATURUS.
Woe for the truth,
Had every mystery remain'd untrack'd!

VIVIA.
There are some mysteries, I scarce begin
To thread them, but from out them up springs love,
Flies through them like a bird along a grove,

And sings them to forgetfulness in joy.
But one e'en now doth come to hold her mute:
Oppression yet doth crush with iron foot,
And tyranny makes strong iniquity,
Though a Redeemer hath appear'd for man,
Who bade us look to heaven for a God
Who made us, loves us, bids us love each other;
Our will is happiness for those we love,—
Our power is so much weaker than our will;—
But Love omnipotent?——

SATURUS.

I do believe,
Were love omnipotent within ourselves,
Woe were extinct. I cannot answer thee—
I am but man, while He is God o'er all.
Yet as a man show manliness in this,
That I will trust the Pow'r hath given me all,
Nor meanly scant my thankfulness with doubt.
The mystery sleeps, while Faith, with arms afold,
Over a trusting heart, sits smiling by.
It sleeps, o'er-canopied by starry heavens,
And cradled in earth's beauty. Let it rest:
While sunshine comes to herald in the day;
While flow'rs and breezes intermingle sweets;
While birds still warble gladness out, like light
Athwart the azure heav'ns; while mountains stand—
Those silent, shadowy chroniclers of time—
To wake within our eyes and hearts a worship;
While yon great joy of God, the ocean, heaves
To seek the skies that mate it in his glory;
While stately pageants throng the heav'ns by day,
And multitudinous brightness crowds the night;
While the calm interposing twilight comes,
Tender and gracious, hand in hand with these
Her grander sisters—(see, yon unmatchable star
Now decks her dusky forehead into light!);
While man, the fine epitome of all,
Is master made of all, yea, more than all—
Hath given to him a mind that can create
Worlds endless out of this, with leave of choice
Of what or seemeth good or ill to him;
While love, the crowning gift that comes from heav'n,
A ray that streams direct from forth the Godhead,
Lights up an earthborn man into an angel,
Who wings his way to heaven upon the track;
While for each sorrow, high and strong soe'er,
There lives a stronger good may ride the wave,

Singing the while its triumph to the skies,—
Oh, can we stay to question pain—why art thou?
Nor take at once the way she points to joy!
Beware of doubt, that gloomiest, coldest cloud,
A shroud of death in life for human hearts."—p. 60.

The individuality, the inward life and soul of courage in Perpetua, are finely pictured in these lines:—

"The world I fear not,—
Its thought of me did never have a thought;
Things in themselves for their own sake I seek,
And not regard of others in them, or
I ne'er had follow'd in the Christian track.
You do not know how often I have turn'd
Unto these silent marbles, there to try
And gaze away a weariness of soul,
Forgetting in their graciousness awhile
Others' forgetfulness of what they owe
Unto their nobler natures. Never yet
Found I true dignity in any one
Who let the world's opinion cripple thought,
Sure of revenge upon the outward form,
Whose finer graces only wait on freedom.
The world's opinion! O what were it? What
The entire that wealth could give? I would give all—
How joyfully!—for one approving smile
Like that which once did bless a little child.

SATURUS.

Think of thy child!

VIVIA.

I now could go and fold him to my heart,
Bequeath my love in one long kiss, and then
Lie down on earth, and listen for my death
Quietly as his sleep, ere I could live
To have him question of his mother's eyes,
And they did shame to look on him."—p. 68.

The final scene with her father in the prison is one of the most powerful in the poem,—but we must forbear to quote those passages of it which utterly annihilate all sympathy with Vivius, and destroy, to our feeling, all pain in her filial sacrifice for the love of Christ. In Perpetua's case we are not made to sympathize with the daughter's struggle in her obedience to the Lord, "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me:" and we are too forcibly reminded of the other

scriptural form of expressing the same sentiment, "He that hateth not father or mother is not worthy of me."

"VIVIUS.

Do ye know me, who I am?—No, no—no wonder!
I am older many years since yester morn.
I was before that time a man nam'd Vivius,
A happy father, who did read his hopes
Upon the noble brows, and, as he thought,
The most true brows, of a beloved daughter!
I am—I know not what. And when I ask
Help of the outward universe to bring
Back to myself the former consciousness,
The sun shuts up the while I look on him;
The stars all hurry past me while I pray;
The earth sinks from my feet: all false!—all false!

VIVIA.

No bitterness now!

VIVIUS.

No bitterness?—gods,
No bitterness!

VIVIA.

My father, that thou could'st
Crowd all thyself at once into one thought!
Think of the faith—look on me as I stand,
A creature anguished at thy agony,—
How far beyond the morrow's suffering!—
One who hath lost even the few brief hours
She reckoned as her own to tend her child;—
Then think upon the faith that bids my heart
Have yet beneath it all, a hope as calm
As were his lids when last I parted from him.
Whence comes such miracle—of whom such faith?

VIVIUS.

Faith! faith!—is that the word?—and miracle!
Yes!—that thy tongue would stir to speak the word!
What is thy faith?—a lie. What are its fruits?
What made thee false to me? What made thee thus
Show forth fine joys to woo me in thy face,—
A black'ning plague-spot hidden in thy breast;—
Lur'd me to build my trust on thee for rock,
While thou wert rotten as the poisonous heap
The sea throws up for waste? And this is faith!
A lie!—it is a lie!

VIVIA.

No more! forbear!
I see, though thou dost not, God's angel stand
Shelt'ring my hope in thee! Thou shalt not speak,
Lest he be moved to stretch a ruffled wing
Up to the Lord, with those accusing words.
I will not have thee less before the Lord
When I shall plead for thee,—as plead I will—
Plead for the earthly father, who once taught
His child in youth to love the truth, so led
Unto the heav'nly. Hath it been gainsay'd?
Thou know'st it hath not. Thou dost know 'twas love,
And love alone, that, fearful of thy grief,
Delay'd to bring it on thee, hoping still
A way might show to mitigate the pang.
And I will not be lesser than I am,
Unworthy as I am for this emprize;—
For thy sake, not. 'Twas thou who mad'st me true,
And true I am; 'twas thou who mad'st me dare,
And I have dar'd."—p. 176.

The last extract we must give is the speech of Perpetua to her servant and sister, her fellow Christian and fellow martyr, as they pass on together to their death:—

"Courage, Felicitas!—my sister, peace! [*Kisses her.*
A few short moments, and we are with Christ.
Farewell!—it is no word—and yet, farewell!
My blessing—oh, my blessing—take once more,
My brothers, brethren all! And if, Cæcilius,
Thou and my Thascius meet, tell him, although
No mother's name he knows, a mother's love
Clung round him with her life; a mother's heart
Yearn'd for him in her death; a mother's pray'r
Was her last utterance. My child! my Thascius!
Christ, make him thine!—though baptism such as this
May be the way thy wisdom seeth best
To bring him to his mother's arms in heaven!
[*She throws her arm round* FELICITAS, *and they pass within the gate.*"—p. 196.

We would, in conclusion, speak most respectfully of a mind whose taste and sympathies have led to the adoption of so pure a theme,—and of the powers that have turned its capabilities to such rich account. Numberless are the beauties of feeling, the unfoldings of the deep, sacred, and mysterious heart, which keep alive a constant interest, and manifest the poet's insight. The faults we have suggested, and we are by no means infal-

lible in such matters, and would speak with modesty, are rather failures in Art than deficiencies of Nature. If this, as we believe, is a first attempt in poetry, it raises high hopes for the future, and we shall rejoice to meet the author again in this most difficult walk of literature, when she shall have taken confidence to write solely from the simplicity and earnestness of her own heart, without departing from reality, or seeking, afar, the adventitious charm of fancy or ornament, as though she modestly distrusted what herself supplied.

---

## SONNET.

I CALL my little child unto my knee,
He leaves his play, and resting his small hand
Gently on mine, most quietly doth stand,
Waiting in patience till I set him free;
And his sweet face looketh up lovingly,
Without a shade of doubt at my command,
But fond confidingness, expression bland
Of pure affection in his eyes I see.
Oh if the earthly parent does receive
Such willing duty, loving reverence,
From the free spirit of his spotless child,
Far more should He, who willeth not to grieve
His erring children, but doth e'er dispense
All chastisement, in love and mercy mild.

ART. II.—TWELVE LECTURES, IN ILLUSTRATION AND DEFENCE OF CHRISTIAN UNITARIANISM. By J. SCOTT PORTER. 8vo. pp. 170. London: Green, Mardon.

THIS is a work admirably adapted for popular use. It is a broad and effective, yet just, statement of the relative claims, merits, and evidences of Unitarianism and Trinitarianism. It is direct, plain, and vigorous, presenting the great features of the question in full and striking lights. It does not pretend to more than this, nor does it accomplish more. It is a popular statement, manifestation, and defence of Christian Unitarianism. It affects no originality, yet it is always fresh, and conveys that charm the most delightful to a reader, the feeling that the sentiments and thoughts are reproduced by the writer, and are springing into life from a moved and earnest heart. We know not that there is a new thought or illustration in the book, yet there is not a page that is stale, or borrowed, or tame. Every where there is the impress of a living mind, speaking from itself, and clothing even familiar views with its own individuality. This is exactly the exhibition of Unitarianism that the great mass of Trinitarians require, not too critical, or philosophical, or refined, yet partaking of all these qualities, and presented in the lights of Scripture, of history, of reason, of feeling, of the moral nature and requirements of man.

Mr. Porter is an Arian, but he attaches no essential importance to the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ. This is an honourable peculiarity, by which we fear he is almost distinguished amongst Arians. Few men will admit a gratuitous difficulty into their creed: if they cannot find a practical reason for a doctrine they will not encumber themselves with its defence. The Trinitarian Theology has mainly sprung from the necessity of finding *offices* for the three persons in the Trinity. Mr. Porter thinks that the example of Christ is equally obligatory and influential on the Arian and the Humanitarian view. But if Christ was a man, our powers, our destinies, our possible perfection, were exhibited on one of like nature with ourselves; not so, if he was a pre-existent angel. As an exhibition of God's will, Christ's life, if Christ was an angel, would still hold good, but not as an exhibition of man's power to do God's will. The moral, the personally binding power of the example ceases to exist. How can the example of an angel be urged home on the conscience of a man? If there is no alliance between their

powers, what alliance is there between their duties? What argument can logically be maintained from the immortality of an angel to the immortality of a man? Christ's resurrection sinks from a supernatural representation of human destiny, of man's alliance with God, into a mere testimony, borne by God to the providential mission of the angel; nay we do not know enough of the nature of angels to refer the resurrection of one, in a body that it had assumed for a time, to the special interference of Deity. Only on a man could God exhibit the divine image in man. Only in a man could God impersonate the duties and the destinies of man. Only on a man could God show forth the immortality of a man. There is neither obligation in the example, nor logic in the argument drawn from Christ's resurrection to that of the whole human race, if the Christ was not one of the human race. Mr. Porter himself urges against Trinitarianism that the doctrine of two natures in Christ destroys the effect of his example. But one of these natures was human, and suffered all that a man can suffer, though the divine nature suffered nothing. But in Arianism the whole spiritual nature is superhuman, and what can we know of the sufferings of an angelic essence, or of its power to resist pain? Once more, is not an angelic nature, a pre-existent spirit lodging in the body of an infant, and *growing* in favour with God and man, passing through childhood, boyhood, manhood, a difficulty of exactly the same *kind* as that which Arians, and Mr. Porter among them, oppose to the Trinitarian hypothesis of the Deity taking flesh and dwelling amongst us? Indeed the difficulty, though less in one sense as not involving the union of two natures in the person of Christ, is in another sense greater, as the Arian hypothesis requires that the pre-existent angel should dwell in the body of the infant Jesus, and under the apparent form and developments of childhood be actually veiling and concealing the highest and most perfect of created minds,—whilst in the Trinitarian Hypothesis it is not necessary to suppose the union of the two natures until the period of the baptism of the Christ. We confess we do not see how any one who is not stopped by the difficulties of Arianism can find any thing insuperable in the difficulties of Trinitarianism. However, we cordially sympathize with Mr. Porter's spirit. Far be it from us to divide the Unitarian world on such a question, and whatever may be our views of Scripture, Reason, and Philosophy on this subject, we feel assured, on no theoretic grounds, but from the perusal of his book, that Mr. Porter has lost nothing of the truest and purest influences of Christianity.

The work is very complete in its plan: it embraces the whole

field of the Trinitarian Controversy. The first six Lectures are occupied with the external evidences of Unitarianism, as the Faith of the Old Testament, of Christ and his Apostles, and of the Primitive Church,—and the last six Lectures illustrate its internal evidences, its moral character, its influences and practical efficacy, and its accordance with the nature and wants of man, as a rational, a devotional, a benevolent, a holy, a consolatory, and a progressive Faith. These topics are indeed not philosophically distinct, but they form an excellent popular classification of the leading characteristics of any Religion that is worthy of God and sufficient for man, and they afford an opportunity of presenting many interesting views of practical Religion, and likewise of directly meeting many prevalent popular objections to Unitarian Christianity. The subjects of the last six Lectures cannot in strictness be separated from one another, but much of impression and of touching illustration would have been lost if the Preacher had sacrificed his appropriate aims and functions for the sake of a more philosophical arrangement.

In meeting the argument for the Omniscience of Christ drawn from John ii. 24, 25, "*But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men,*" Mr. Porter proposes the translation, "*Jesus did not commit himself unto them because he knew them all.*" There is nothing in the passage to prove omniscience, in any sense of it, and the suggested translation we think singularly unhappy. It does not meet the necessities of the very next clause, "*and needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man,*" and it has no application whatever to Nicodemus, with whom our Lord was not previously acquainted,—and with whose visit, by night, the verse in question has so close a connection that it ought not to have been separated from it by the division of chapters.

We cannot at all agree with Mr. Porter's view of the use of the expression "Holy Spirit," in the Scriptures. He denies its personality and consequently its deity,—and regards it mainly as signifying the power of God manifested in miracles. That Mr. Porter should disown the Arian doctrine of the personality of the Holy Spirit is only what we should expect from him; for a doctrine more unmeaning, more revolting to all sound scriptural interpretation, it is impossible to conceive. But surely there is no clearer scriptural usage than that of the holy Spirit, for the spirit of God, and consequently for God himself. When the soul of man is moved by the spirit of God, then man is said to partake of the spirit of God. And is it not so, even without a figure? In all right states of the soul are we not one with God as Christ was one with God, and is not

the spirit of God in us and dwelling with us? It is frigid and totally foreign to the genius of Christianity, to its intimate feeling of the possible union between the human and divine spirit, to speak of the Holy Spirit as an attribute or power. It is God himself, but chiefly God in his connections with the soul of man, natural or supernatural.

As an example of the freedom and freshness of Mr. Porter's style, though a little out of place, we are tempted to give a passage which lies on the page (p. 74) we have been last criticizing. He had very successfully been disposing of the inferential argument for the Deity of Christ drawn from the supposed ascription to him in various passages of divine honours, and he thus closes his examination of these passages :—

"Now if these passages do not establish the points in question, they cannot possibly be established; for those that have been selected are among the strongest and clearest that ever have been, or that can be brought forward in their support. Is there a man in this assembly, who, if he were upon a jury empanelled to try a case of £20 value, would feel himself justified in giving his verdict upon either side, on evidence so irrelevant, so wide of the point at issue? And yet on such evidence we are called upon to award the sovereignty of the world to one who never claimed it for himself,—who always consistently declared it to be the sole right and property of another! And we are told, that, unless we pronounce this unwarrantable judgment, we forfeit all hope of our eternal salvation!"

We shall give another example of the same homely strength, combining a directness and a solemn earnestness well fitted to be very effective with a popular audience :—

"In former lectures, I have compared the Unitarian and Trinitarian systems, with reference to their agreement or disagreement with Scripture, and I think I advanced some solid reasons, from our sacred books, for the hope that is in me. I have now briefly contrasted a few of them together, with reference to their claims respectively, to the designation of rational. I have shown you, that Unitarianism involves nothing that can be considered as self-contradictory, absurd, or irrational. I have shown, that the commonly-received hypothesis involves a number of contradictions in its very statement: that these contradictions have not been, and cannot be removed; that, therefore, its doctrines cannot possibly be believed by any one who considers the meaning of the terms in which they are expressed, without violating the laws of the human mind; and that this opposition between reason and orthodoxy, is so far from being denied, that it has been admitted, nay, asserted and gloried in, by some of the most able writers who ever maintained the Trinitarian doctrine. Here then I close the case for the present. I put it to you, as reasonable and accountable beings, to weigh the evidence, and deter-

mine which of the two systems is the rational faith; and were you on your oaths, as a jury to try the point, I should fearlessly look for your verdict. You are not upon your oaths at present; but you are every day of your lives upon your consciences; and remember, I beseech you, that you will one day be on your trial."

We must pass over the first six Lectures on the evidences of Unitarian Christianity, Scriptural and Historical, with a general commendation of their force, breadth and clearness, though we cannot always agree with Mr. Porter's criticism of individual texts, and in treating of the faith of the primitive Church he assigns an importance to the Epistles of Clement and Polycarp which we think by no means their due. Upon the whole however we do not know where, in the same compass, so comprehensive and convincing a summary could be found, of the principal external evidences of our Faith,—though we cannot say, nor indeed would the compass permit of it, that the examination of the counter evidence is equally satisfactory.

We turn with almost unmixed pleasure to Mr. Porter's delineation of the moral power of our faith, of its adaptation to the conscience, to the griefs and joys, to the weakness and strength, to the aspirations and struggles of man. There is a reality in the delineation of this moral power that fits it to be impressive on every class of minds. The author indeed, here as before, does not leave the beaten course, but he makes it his own; he sees with his own eyes, and feels with his own heart. And though he travels on the thoroughfare where many have gone before him, he makes it evident that he could have asserted and maintained a right of road if none had existed before. He sheds his light upon the old paths, mainly because he has no love of singularity. We are inclined to believe that he has no desire either to be considered, or to be, an original thinker,—and we are led to doubt whether he ever tasks his mind to the utmost, and calls out of it the noblest and most perfect things it is capable of producing. There is an easy power, a fatal facility, with which a nature capable of so much must not be satisfied.

We shall now without much of remark or criticism present our readers with a rather copious selection from these forcible illustrations of the moral character and efficacy of Unitarian Christianity. Mr. Porter exposes "the tactics of holy war," which consist in first running down, most furiously, the distinguishing characteristics of an opponent's creed, and when at last it is found that the more they are opposed the more do they rise up in condemnation of the opposer, in suddenly turning round and appropriating, as peculiarly one's own, the

very qualities that had previously been ridiculed and disowned. The Trinitarian Controversialists have followed this course in their treatment of our claims, first, to be the peculiar vindicators of the Unity of God, and secondly, to exhibit a peculiar harmony between our Reason and our Faith.

"It is curious to see how the religious world will sometimes begin by hurling anathemas against a particular system of faith, and by denouncing the name which expresses that system, as the index of every thing that is false and dangerous; and will persevere, both long and vehemently, in repeating the denunciation; but if, notwithstanding all the clamour and abuse, the obnoxious name grows at last into some respectability, the very party which thus clamoured against it and abused it, will end by turning round and claiming that very name for themselves. So it has been with the term Unitarian. It was at one time regarded by the Orthodox as a synonyme for all that is false in theology and corrupt in moral feeling. To call a man a Unitarian was then like fixing a brand upon his brow. But at length this very name Unitarian was claimed, amidst the applause of his party, by a Prelate of the Established Church, as the birthright of the Orthodox. And some years ago it was publicly assumed to himself, by the champion of the Trinity in this town, and our exclusive right to it was openly contested and denied. And as this has been the case with Unitarianism, so has it also been with the equivalent designation which I have prefixed to this lecture, viz., a Rational Faith. We have seen with wonder, that notwithstanding all the denunciations which have been fulminated against human reason, as corrupt and blind and totally depraved; and notwithstanding all the outcry that has been raised against the profession of rational views upon religion, as savouring of carnal pride and sinful arrogance; and notwithstanding all the anathemas which have been pronounced against religionists who are not prepared to exhibit a 'total prostration of the understanding,' we have seen, not without wonder, notwithstanding all this, an advocate of orthodoxy put in a claim, on behalf of his own party, to the designation of rational Christians. After all, we ought not, perhaps, to feel surprise at this denial of our right to possess or employ a title, of which we have been left in possession so long, and the use of which has subjected us to censures so severe. Such changes have taken place before, and I suppose we ought not to be astonished when we witness a similar transposition once again.*

"Observe, however, the difference between us and our opponents upon this point. We do not believe that reason is corrupt, depraved, and totally opposite to all good. We think, on the contrary, that it is a great and glorious gift, which the Creator has bestowed upon us to guide us to the knowledge of truth; and that when faithfully used, it is capable of performing its noble functions well. We therefore covet an

* "These sentences refer to the title of a lecture which was announced as about to be delivered in one of the Meeting-houses in Belfast, the object of which was to prove that Trinitarianism is a Rational System of Belief."

accordance with reason as an honour and a distinction of no common worth. Under all circumstances we esteem it as an honour, if it can be said with truth, that our conduct or our opinions are agreeable to reason. But how stands the case, according to the views of those who call themselves the orthodox? According to them, reason is, and has been since the fall, not only blind but corrupt; not only incapable of guiding to the truth, but actually so constituted that it must always and of necessity lead astray. And yet it seems they consider it as an injurious aspersion upon their system of doctrine to be told that we assert ours to be more agreeable to reason than theirs! They think their creed is maligned if it be called irrational! They are desirous of claiming for their own way of thinking the merit of being in accordance with reason; and are prepared to meet us upon the question, whether their system or ours be entitled to the designation of a rational faith. Now I rejoice to hear of such a claim being put in; for it shows that one of our doctrines, at least, has been firmly established in the minds of men, and one of the points of old orthodoxy has been abandoned; for, unless the old orthodox doctrine of the blindness and corruption of human reason be given up, no man could regard a conformity to reason as any honour to himself or to his creed. I rejoice therefore, to hear of the claim which has been put in; and I shall not fail to advert to it hereafter, as one of the many proofs of the silent spread of some of our leading opinions beyond the pale of our own denomination."—p. 102.

In the Lecture on "Unitarianism,—a devotional Faith," we are reminded at every page that Channing has exhausted the illustrations "of the tendency of Unitarianism to form an elevated religious character." It is no reproach to any one that in treating of this subject they must occupy his ground, for he has left no ground untouched. Still Mr. Porter writes from himself even when advancing the very arguments that forcibly recal to us that unrivalled Discourse of Dr. Channing. In the following passage, the argument is exceedingly well put:—

"They tell us, as we have already seen, that in their formulas they speak, it is true, of three persons, each of whom is God; but then, they add, they do not use the word person in its common signification, nor is it exactly fitted to express the relation which the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, bear to each other. They use it, therefore, only for want of a better term; and they profess themselves unable to give any definition whatsoever of the meaning of the word in this application. Thus it appears that the Three Persons are not Three Persons. Some have proposed to call them three Subsistences; three Subsistences in One God: some would have us say, three Distinctions in the One God; some call them three Somewhats. Now what can be the influence and power of the devotional feelings in the soul of man, when he bows down in adoration before three *Distinctions*? One can hardly frame a prayer in which the epithet of *Somewhat* should be introduced, without

appearing to cast ridicule on the whole subject; but if any one will substitute the phrase *Three Somewhats* for that of *Three Persons*, in that formula, 'O Holy, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity, Three Persons and One God,' he will speedily perceive that the words are calculated to give rise to any feelings except those of devotion. Now all such notions, however expressed, however explained, are calculated to perplex, confuse, and mystify. They darken counsel by words without knowledge. They leave the mind without any precise or definite idea on which it can fix; and to them the bewildered worshipper might apply the language of Mary Magdalene in the garden,—'*They have taken away our Lord, and we know not where they have laid him.*' Most certainly the Unitarian is justified in addressing to those who entertain these perplexed and mysterious notions of the Godhead,—'*Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship.*' It surely can require no argument to show which of these two systems is better calculated to inspire a deep-seated, rational, and serious piety."—p. 121.

The following passage is of a much higher order both of thought and feeling. It contains deep truth in its fitting garb of beauty. It is the right sort of proof that Unitarianism is a devotional faith,—for it *excites* devotion in the reader's breast,—and it could only have sprung from a devotional spirit. The true illustrations of power are those that make us conscious of its presence while we thrill beneath it. This is the highest praise of these illustrations. They *make us* devotional, benevolent, holy in aspiration and desire, rejoicing in faith, whilst we are reading these manifestations of the spirit and practical efficacy of our Christianity:—

"There is still a third point, in which I discern the superiority of Unitarianism, as a devotional system. It accords with the teachings of nature. It brings the world of creation, and that of redemption, into complete harmony. It views them both as bearing a united and perfectly accordant testimony regarding the Great Being who is the common author of both. Nor is this of trifling importance. In our frail and imperfect state we have need of every help to awaken and keep alive our devout feelings. Often do such sentiments arise within the soul, from the contemplation of some of the external works of the Most High God. A glance at the starry heavens will, to the soul inspired by contemplation, suggest more themes of adoration and of awe for the Omnipotent Creator and Ruler, than could be called forth by a thousand sermons. A plant, a flower, an insect, may suggest ideas which speak more truly and forcibly to the heart than any words from the lips of man. Indeed, as every mind has its own peculiar method of observation and of reasoning, the diversities of form in which these pious considerations may present themselves are absolutely endless. It is of the utmost consequence to beings such as we are, and situated as we are, that these precious hints should be seized, detained, dwelt upon,

and treasured up. It is of great importance that the most should be made of them—that none of them should be permitted to pass us by until it has paid to us its tribute of instruction and delight. Thus will the habit be formed of looking to God, and living in God,—seeing God in all things, and all things in God :—nor can any habit be more conducive to the formation of deep, and tranquil, and affectionate sentiments of piety and devotion. But the Unitarian alone can possess this advantage in its proper measure; because he alone entertains those ideas, both of the works and word of God, by which they are caused to blend their voices in concert, and mutually aid each other's power. For, whatever has been argued with respect to the Book of Revelation, it has never been denied that the Book of Nature is Unitarian. If the heavens declare the glory of God, they declare the glory of but One God—if the firmament showeth his handiwork, it showeth the handiwork of none but one. It says nothing of a Trinity in Unity, or Unity in Trinity. It affords no basis for devotion directed to such an object. The votary of nature may be a devout Trinitarian; but his devotion is not of nature's teaching, forming, on strengthening ;—from that source it can derive no aid. To him Nature and Revelation speak in different languages, if they do not directly contradict each other; and it requires the utmost exertion of theologic skill to bring their declarations into accordance. Here then the Unitarian derives increase and confirmation of his devotional feelings from that which always must, to men of other creeds, tend more or less to draw away their minds and hearts from what are to them the only principles of true and real piety. It is not in this instance alone that Unitarianism and Nature are in agreement, where, between nature and religion, on other systems, there is war. Thus, there are creeds which tell us, that all the virtues and graces which can be displayed before the eyes of men,—the warm love of the parent to the child, and the child to the parent, the noble spirit of the patriot, the self devotion of the philanthropist, the enduring affection which can watch and tend its object, and wear the frame away in the anxious endeavour to mitigate pain,—the purity that can spurn the most tempting object of worldly desire, when incompatible with virtue and honour, and can submit to loss and shame and degradation, rather than forfeit self-esteem, or wound the conscience,—there are creeds which tell us, that all these are perfectly compatible with hearts unrenewed, and with a character and condition in which the Almighty can find nothing to approve and nothing to love; a character which is only a mass of corruption, and which can give rise to nothing but evil. This is contrary to the teachings of nature. The soul instinctively repels and banishes the idea. It is the creed of the book, sometimes the conviction of the head, but it never is the persuasion of the heart. But I confine the observation of the harmony between nature and Unitarian Christianity to their tendency to promote and strengthen a devotional spirit; because, in this respect, their agreement is most conspicuous, and the superiority possessed by Unitarianism over every other form of the Christian religion is, in this point of view, not only the most striking, but the most important."—p. 123.

How just is this rebuke of the narrow spirit of Churches which forms the introduction of the Lecture on "Unitarianism —a benevolent Faith:"—

"*By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one towards another.* This was the test of membership which the dying Saviour bequeathed to his church—the best undoubtedly that could be framed; and yet of all possible or conceivable tests, the only one which the bulk of his professing followers, at least in modern times, have never for one moment thought of employing. We have seen churches asserting that unless we submit our consciences to the yoke of their infallibility, we cannot be disciples of Christ. We have seen churches asserting, that unless we agree with them in every dim mysterious point of disputed theology, we cannot be disciples of Christ. We have seen them declaring that unless we solemnly profess to accord even with the political principles laid down in their creeds, framed in times of ignorance, and turbulence, and civil confusion, we cannot be disciples of Christ; and maintaining that unless we can go with them, even to the length of dooming to everlasting perdition the persons who, in the exercise of their private judgment, arrive at different conclusions from those which they profess to have reached, we cannot be disciples of Christ. Many churches have practically said, 'Unless ye anathematize, and excommunicate, and devote to condemnation your Christian brethren,—unless you exclude them, and denounce them and revile them,—ye cannot be disciples of your Saviour.' Such are the modern tests of Orthodoxy in too many of the churches of our Lord. Alas! how few are there in which the test that the Saviour himself has instituted is practically employed:—'*By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one towards another!*' While many are regarded as Orthodox, on the ground of their sectarian zeal and party spirit, how few are willing to admit the Orthodoxy of love!

"I cannot but regard the test proposed by our Lord Jesus Christ, in these beautiful and comprehensive words, as the best that ever was invented. Would to God that men had been content to leave the question of discipleship on the footing on which the Saviour placed it! Would to God that they had been content to confine their definitions within the same limits to which our Lord restricted his! Would to God they had been willing to leave that unrestricted, which he never restrained, and to allow the liberty which he recognised. But thus it has not been; and I fear we cannot speedily anticipate a time when thus it will be. A calm spectator of characters and events—some of them even of recent occurrence—might be induced to think that some of our Lord's professing followers read his words as here recorded, with the insertion of a negative; and that they supposed him to have declared,—*By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have* NO *love one towards another:*—no love, no charity, no candour, no forbearance, even with their involuntary and unavoidable mistakes; no feelings but those of alienation, contempt, and hatred, and abhorrence."—p. 130.

In the Lecture on "Unitarianism—a holy Faith," Mr. P. in his just horror of the doctrine of Salvation by Dogmas or Opinions, alone, has overlooked the truth and depth of the Scripture Doctrine of Salvation by Faith. He has conceded to the Orthodox their use of the word Faith as if it was the true one, and we know not how, in consistency with this concession, he could interpret St. Paul's "Righteousness of God by Faith," which the Apostle evidently considers to be the true fruit and working of the spirit of Christianity. Mr. Porter declares, somewhat rashly, that he "rejoices in the conviction that there is not a single Unitarian Minister who countenances, nor a single Unitarian family who embraces, nor, so far as he ever could learn, a single Unitarian Christian who holds this pernicious tenet," viz. "Salvation by Faith alone." Now putting the word "alone" for the present out of view, it is certain that "Salvation by Faith" was to St. Paul the very soul of Christianity. And so it is. It is trust in God that saves the soul. It is faith in the divine light and voice within us that enables us to overcome the world of sight and sense. Works entitle no man to heaven, make no man worthy of heaven. It is the true heart behind our poorest deeds, aspiring, penitent, and self-condemning in moments of utmost feebleness, the clinging faith in heavenly love, surviving even our weakness, our despondency, and our faithless tears, the confidence that God will look upon the desires, and efforts, and affections of the soul, and apply no outward measurements to the poor child of clay,—this it is that lifts the trusting spirit into communion with the source of holiness, and saves the soul through hope. Salvation by works we consider to be a more immoral, unspiritual, presumptuous, and self-righteous doctrine than salvation by Faith, accepting Faith in its only scriptural sense, of the soul's surrender of itself to the monitions, and guidings, and promises of the Father of our spirits. We have no doubt that we should have no dispute with Mr. Porter on this subject, and that there is nothing really to object to except the accidental omission to reclaim to Unitarianism, the great scriptural and spiritual Doctrine of "the Righteousness of God by Faith," a righteousness that must spring from the same affections in man as in God, and of which a loving Faith in the God of conscience supplies the nourishing influences.

The following emphatic protest against the false consolations, the impious assurances of forgiveness and glory which Orthodoxy can supply to the guiltiest malefactor after a few hours of spiritual treatment by a sacerdotal magician, the "healing the

hurt of God's people slightly, and crying peace, peace, *where there is no peace,*" is too urgently called for by the monstrous and disgusting cant and quackery of the day, to which even the judges of the land do not scruple to lend an indirect sanction in their unmeaning and traditional addresses to condemned criminals, to allow us to pass it by without notice.

" I know that our Orthodox Fellow-Christians, as they usually denominate themselves, conceive that they have a great advantage over us in the infinite sacrifice for sin, which they think was offered up upon the cross ; whereby full satisfaction was made to the justice of the Father, for the sins of all believers. And our system, which pretends to exhibit no such substitute, and points to no vicarious punishment, is thought to be utterly deficient in those topics which are essentially requisite for comforting and consoling the mind distressed by a conviction of guilt. The justice of this objection I do not admit. Our view offers to the truly penitent, free forgiveness, from the pure and unpurchased grace of God ; and, after all the complex provisions of their complicated creeds, the Orthodox systems can give no more. Besides, I look upon it as the great evil of the views inculcated by our brethren, that the remedy which they propose is, in its nature, equally applicable to the penitent and to the obstinate,—to him who has sinned often and perseveringly,—and to him who has, when once awakened to a sense of his crime, turned away and sinned no more. And I do really believe, that the cause of practical religion has sustained deep injury by the manner in which notorious transgressors of the laws of God and man have been encouraged to express an unhesitating reliance on the efficacy of the blood of Christ to wipe out all their sins. When a man who has lived in open violation of all laws, human and divine, is, by age or sickness, rendered incapable of farther transgression,—when his vices have left him, not he his vices,—when there can be no reasonable doubt, from his long-confirmed habits, that if able to return to his sins, he would return to them without delay,—when such a man, at the approach of death, is encouraged by those who are regarded as experienced and well-instructed Christians,—sometimes by the ministers of religion,—to depart out of the world which he has polluted by a life of guilt, with the language of a triumphant saint—just ripe for paradise—and certain to take his departure, through the boundless efficacy of the Redeemer's sacrifice, to the realms of bliss,—what can the common race of men suppose, but that vice and virtue, piety and profaneness, integrity and fraud, are matters of much indifference in the eye of God, as well as in the estimation of religious men ; and that the only thing that will be required, or can be expected of themselves, is the same bold confidence in the merits of the Redeemer, which is held forth as a sufficient ground of hope and firm assurance to the vilest of sinners among their fellow-creatures ? Is not this, in itself, a dreadful evil ? And is it not increased in magnitude a thousand fold when displayed before the eyes of

the whole community, as in the case of convicted murderers, about to be put to death by the sentence of public justice? We have often beheld, with grief and shame, the vilest criminals—monsters whose atrocities have disgraced the name of man—taught and encouraged by clergymen and others, who have visited them previously to their execution,—to entertain the most unbounded, but, as it appears to me, the most presumptuous confidence. Such monsters of iniquity have often expressed themselves, even on the scaffold, when about to be launched into eternity, in a style of triumph scarcely suitable even for the lips of holy martyrs, about to die for a religion which, throughout their lives, they had loved and adorned. And when pious men and ministers of the Gospel stand by and witness such scenes, and raise no protest against the language which they hear,—when they sanction and countenance the criminal in all this bold hope and firm assurance,—nay, when it is known that their own urgent and assiduous exertions have contributed to inspire it, and that the wretched being, who gives it utterance, is only clinging to ideas which they have suggested, and giving oral expression to words which they have put into his mouth;—thousands and thousands of uninstructed Christians are taught a most dangerous lesson. They are practically, and therefore most effectually and impressively taught, that the firm assurance of the enjoyments of heaven is perfectly compatible with the unrestrained gratification of the foulest appetites, and the most malignant passions upon earth. The lesson has unfortunately been learned by many only too well; and too faithfully has it been carried into practice, as the dark records of crime and guilt bear witness.* Unitarianism esteems too dearly the honour of religion and of God, and prizes too highly the interests of morality and the general good of mankind, to hold out any hope or consolation such as this. We presume not to limit the mercy of our Maker; but we feel obliged to refrain from encouraging hopes to which we think reason and the word of God lend no sanction,—hopes which appear to us to be at variance, both with the holiness and justice of the Almighty."—p. 156.

The last Lecture on "Unitarianism—a progressive Faith," has a deceptive title. The meaning conveyed by the title is, that there is in Unitarian Christianity an element of self-development, the seeds of inward life and growth, a principle of indefinite expansion, raising the prepared soul to truer and higher views of God, of duty, and of Providence. If this is not the case, if Christianity does not open new glories to nobler

* "No one who attentively considers the subject can fail to see the powerful argument which the circumstances alluded to in the Lecture afford against the continuance of capital punishment; a penalty which, from its very nature, is of all others the most shocking to the spirit of the pious, the moral, and the humane; that is, of the persons who stand in no need of any penalty against crime, to deter them from offending; and the least regarded by the profane, the hardened, the profligate, and the ferocious—the very persons on whom it would be desirable to make some impression. The savage penalties have rendered criminals more savage; and it is high time that an effectual effort were made for their total abolition."

minds, there is no objection to Creeds, except the mere difficulty of finding the true one. Christian truth itself is not infinite, and would suffer no injury and enthralment from being defined in fixed and unchanging words. This progressiveness is a vital characteristic of the true Christianity, and is pursued by Unitarianism alone. This spiritual want, which every true religion must supply, is overlooked in these Lectures, and Unitarianism is styled a progressive Faith in the sense of external diffusion, that it is "spreading" through the world, to use a phrase first introduced by Priestley,—that it has made and is making converts. The Lecture contains such an able summary of the historical progress of Unitarianism, and presents so much information which every Unitarian should know, that we shall quote from it at great length,—and we do so with the more pleasure because it relates the rise and spread of Unitarianism in Ireland, the native country of Mr. Porter, and the scene of his earnest labours and ministry. We earnestly desire a growing union and assimilation between the Unitarians of Ireland and of Great Britain.

"Although all history, both sacred and profane, demonstrates the absurdity of setting up the opinion of the multitude as a test of truth, still we cannot but believe that Divine Providence watches over the faith which the Son of God first preached upon the earth; and that in his own good time the Almighty will give it a clear and decided triumph over every antagonist principle. Of this we feel assured, that his goodness will incline him to promote what is so beneficial to his creatures; his wisdom will suggest the most suitable means of so doing, and his power will enable him to employ those means whenever the fit time for doing so shall have fully come. We must be careful, no doubt, to avoid making our own feeble apprehension the measure of the Omnipotent Architect's designs. His plans are constructed on the scale of eternity. A thousand years are with him but as a single day, and one day as a thousand years. It may please him, for wise and holy purposes—as all his purposes are—to delay the ultimate and decided triumph of truth; but sooner or later it will triumph. The fears of desponding friends, the furious opposition of mistaken enemies, shall be equally rebuked by the great event. Opposition, insult, force, and clamour, shall be equally unavailing. No power will be able to withstand the progress of the mighty current. Truth will finally prevail. If any counsel or any work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, no power of man can overthrow it. It is founded on the rock of God's immutability; and his Almightiness is the warrant for its everlasting permanence.

"If this progressive character of truth, in spite of opposition and obloquy, be assumed as one of its distinctive marks, we may advert to the progress made of late years by Unitarian Christianity, as a collateral proof of its claim to be regarded as identical with the pure and primitive faith of Christ. It has already, though yet in its infancy, attained such

growth as shows, that in its maturity of vigour it is destined to become a giant—possessing, as we hope and believe, the giant's power without his sanguinary disposition.

"In speaking of the progress made by Unitarianism I have used the qualification, *of late years;* because it is only of late years that the profession of Unitarian opinions has been allowed by law in any of the nations of Europe. Most of you are probably aware that the celebrated physician Michael Servetus, having escaped from the dungeons of the Inquisition in France, was detected in Geneva, delivered up to the magistrates by means of John Calvin, and condemned to death for the crime of denying the doctrine of the Trinity. He was accordingly burnt to death—and the great Reformer, who beheld his execution from the window of a house which overlooked the spot, was so overjoyed at the spectacle of his dying tortures that he burst into an irrepressible fit of laughter—and even at the distance of eleven years, in writing to a friend, he avowed and gloried in the deed. '*Servetum, canem illum latrantem compescui!*'—'I quelled,' he says, 'Servetus, that barking dog!' A similar fate overtook the learned Gentili, at Berne. Poland alone afforded a refuge to the unhappy Unitarians; but after a few years the cry of persecution was raised against them—their churches were levelled to the ground—their university and all their flourishing schools were dispersed and broken up by armed force; and finally they were, one and all, by a public decree, banished from the territory of Poland, and scattered to the four winds of heaven, without a home or refuge—being allowed only a few days, in the most inclement season of the year, to prepare for their departure and dispose of their property. Such was the fate of the unhappy Unitarian Church in Poland, which at one time numbered upwards of 100 congregations, in which were included several of the best and noblest families of the republic, and which was adorned by those eminent divines whose works, even yet, are most valuable repertories of scriptural and ecclesiastical learning—Faustus Socinus, Crellius, Schlichtingius, Przipcovius, Wolzogenius, and Wissowatius. The persecution was carried even to the death upon all such as remained, unless they could be prevailed upon to recant: but the illustrious exiles were, by the spectacle of their sufferings, and their virtues, and their heroism, the means of exciting in other countries a deep interest in the cause for which they endured so much and so patiently. This feeling was latent for a season; but in the progress of time it sprung up and brought forth fruit.

"In the British Empire, the law was most severe against all professors of Unitarianism. Not to go farther back than the time of the Reformation, it is well known, that after that event, the writ '*de heretico comburendo*,' or, for burning the heretic, remained in full force; and under this bloody law, many Unitarians were put to death, by their Protestant brethren—by those who had themselves so narrowly escaped the persecution of the Roman Catholics. In the reign of King Edward VI. Joanna Bocher was condemned for heresy, in denying the doctrine of the Trinity—by a court in which Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, sat as judges. Cranmer extorted from the youthful sovereign the signature to the warrant for executing this virtuous and noble-minded lady: and she was

burnt to death! And so was George Van Paris, a foreigner, two years afterwards; of whom his enemies have left this record—that 'he was a man of strict and virtuous life, and very devout; he suffered with great constancy of mind, kissing the stake and faggots that were to burn him.' In the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Wielmacker, Van Toort, Hammond, Lewis, Cole, (a clergyman,) and Francis Ket, were put to death for the like heresies. The Rev. Mr. Burton—who was an eye-witness of the execution of Ket, and one of those who thought his sentence just, and who approved of its being carried into effect—declares, that he was a man of exemplary piety and integrity. The only words which he uttered amidst the flames were, *'Blessed be God! Blessed be God! Blessed be God!'* And in the reign of King James I., Mr. Legate and Mr. Wightman suffered, in the same manner, for the same offence. During the protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, the learned and virtuous Mr. Biddle was apprehended, and would have been put to death by the Parliament; but the Protector rescued him from their fangs, and allowed him to spend the remainder of his life in exile, upon the rock of Scilly. In the reigns of Charles I. and II. and James II. many hundred persons, accused of Unitarianism, were allowed to languish out their miserable lives in perpetual imprisonment. But the last public execution in Great Britain, for this offence, was that of Mr. Thomas Aikenhead, a student of divinity, who was hanged at Edinburgh, on the 16th of January 1697. This was in the reign of King William III. This monarch was known to be inclined to tolerant principles, and fears were entertained lest he should interpose his royal clemency. To prevent this, all the clergy in Edinburgh and the neighbourhood, so inflamed their flocks by violent and inflammatory harangues against the unhappy culprit—during the interval between his sentence and the day of execution—that the Government thought it safest to allow the law to take its course. The ever-memorable Mr. Thomas Emlyn was punished in Ireland, in the reign of Queen Anne, by fine and imprisonment, for his opinions. He had been condemned to the pillory in addition; but that part of the sentence was not carried into effect. Unitarians were expressly excepted from the benefit of the Act of Toleration, both in England and Ireland; and it was not till the year 1817 that Parliament removed the penalties by which the profession of our opinions was visited. It cannot, and ought not, to be concealed that for some years previously they had been left as a dead letter—they disgraced the statute-book—but were not carried into effect.

"I recall these things to memory, not for the purpose of kindling afresh the expiring embers of religious discord—far, far otherwise. I am far from imputing the spirit which these barbarous enactments breathe, to my Fellow-Christians generally, of other Churches, at the present day. They were the consequence of imperfect light; and advancing knowledge has taught men the great lesson of mutual toleration. Among those who now hear me, there are probably many who differ from me very widely in doctrine; but I hope, and firmly believe, there is not one among them who would wish to see me burnt for what he deems my heresy; nor even to be the means of injuring me in my person, property, or liberty. My object in referring to this point, is simply to show, that, until of late

years, our opinions have not had a clear stage and fair play. Our advocates dared scarcely open their mouths. If they did, on any occasion, come forward, there were not wanting learned opponents to meet them in controversy; and if argument failed, there was the last resource—the gibbet and the gallows—the pillory, imprisonment, and fine. I am of opinion, that Unitarianism has not even yet fair play. True it is, that the sanguinary and bloody laws which were intended to extirpate it, have been repealed; but there still remains so much of exclusion—popular odium—misrepresentation—and clamour to contend against, that its advocates require, even now, all the support and strength they can derive from their sense of the importance of their views, and their deep conviction of their truth, to nerve them against the obloquy and opposition which they are certain to encounter. Of this it would not be difficult to produce many striking examples; some of them very recent, and rather remarkable. But this would be an invidious task, and might lead to a misconception of my motives in adverting to the subject. I therefore pass it over, and proceed to show, that notwithstanding all these discouragements, Unitarianism has made a very considerable progress; fully as much as could reasonably have been expected, under the circumstances, and more than enough to encourage its advocates to zeal and perseverance.

"Although there is reason to believe, that there have been, for a good many years, some persons in Ireland, who held the same views of Christian doctrine, substantially, with ourselves, yet it is only a short time since they durst venture to propound their opinions openly, and without reserve. To deny the doctrine of the Trinity,—to deny the supreme deity of Christ,—to deny the alleged efficacy of the blood of Christ, in appeasing the wrath of God,—this is what, I have reason to think, was never ventured upon. The utmost that could be said of our predecessors, of a few generations back, was, that they did not preach up the prevalent and popular doctrines upon these subjects: they scarcely ever dared to preach against them, and if they had, there is reason to think the whole community would have turned against them with anger and reproach. It is just seventeen years since a man was found, who had the courage and integrity to place his sentiments fully and explicitly in print before his people, and before the world: and this was no other than our venerated friend and pastor, Dr. Bruce; whose sermons on the Doctrines of Christianity, printed in 1824, form a memorable æra in the history of religious truth in Ireland. It deserves to be remarked, that although these sermons were preached and printed by one who had been for thirty years previously the officiating minister in this pulpit—although his learning, his character, and the respect in which he was held, must have added weight to his arguments; yet the manly and honest avowal of his sentiments, in this explicit form, was followed by a defection from the congregation of so many families, including several in whom such dissatisfaction was least to have been expected, that the consequences are yet felt, and probably will be, for some time longer. Now, this circumstance marks very decisively the progress of religious knowledge amongst ourselves; for whatever may be the varying shades of sentiment amongst

us, there is no probability that any farther diminution of numbers will take place from this cause. Indeed, the more openly and manfully our views have been propounded, the more they have uniformly spread. Hence of late years, they have spread and are spreading in our own neighbourhood, and in the world around us. In the year 1820, there was not a single congregation, avowedly Unitarian, in Ireland; at present, there are three in Belfast—one of them recently established, but going on most favourably; and which, I trust, will, in a short time, be as respectable by its numbers and social importance, as it is already, from the zeal and ability with which it is conducted.

"In the whole of Ireland, there are now 39 congregations—a number which has been receiving, and would no doubt continue to receive, an increase every year. Nor have these societies assumed their present position in circumstances of peace and rest. They have had much opposition to contend against; they have faced the storm and the battle; and they have grown to be what they are, in spite of all the efforts that have been made by enemies—able, powerful, and unscrupulous. I recollect when I was a student in this town, preparing for the ministry, that all parties with whom I conversed—both those of new-light and old-light opinions, as they were then called—agreed in opinion that Unitarianism was sinking fast; going down and down, deeper and deeper, and no prospect of its emerging in the life of man. The ruin of our cause was prophesied to me by my fellow-students and others. I confess, I viewed the matter in the same light; I thought there was not a single congregation in Ireland, that, if it became vacant, would accept the services of a person holding my opinions; these opinions I never had and never would have concealed; and I thought, that in choosing the ministry for my profession, I had condemned myself to perpetual exile. I am not yet, however, a very old man, and I thank God I have lived to see 39 congregations in my native country—several among them numerous and respectable—coming forward to claim that honourable title; and humble though my services were, I have been privileged to lend assistance in founding and establishing new congregations of the same sentiments in Ballymoney, Carrickfergus, Ballyhemlin, Ravara, Comber, Ralloo, and York Street, Belfast. Here, then, there is progress; there is life; there is a demonstration, that Unitarianism has taken hold upon the public mind; and every prospect that it will retain the hold which it has gained.

"In Scotland, Unitarianism is but a thing of yesterday. In 1826, Dr. Chalmers boasted—and the boast was true—that all the Church accommodation possessed by Unitarians in that country put together, would only afford seats for 1500 people; and that of these one half were unoccupied. The inference drawn, was, that Unitarianism was a weakly plant; that it had not thriven, and could not thrive in the ungenial climate of Caledonia. But it was only for want of cultivation that it had not prospered. The boast of Dr. Chalmers induced the Rev. George Harris to resign his Chapel in England, and accept the charge of the Glasgow Unitarian Congregation. By his exertions, that congregation alone numbers a body of people greater than that assigned by the learned Doctor to the whole kingdom. I have myself preached in the Glasgow

congregation, to an audience of at least 900 persons actually present: eleven other congregations have risen up or have been revived; and there is every prospect of yet more and greater increase. And all this may be said to have been effected during the last twelve or fourteen years.

"But not to dwell upon particulars, there are in England about 300 Unitarian congregations; many of them numerous, almost all of them respectable, and influential in their respective neighbourhoods,—presided over by a body of ministers, who, for learning, for zeal, and single-hearted integrity, are second to no clergy with which I am acquainted in the world. There are in America 2500 Unitarian congregations; the whole of which have either been formed, or have adopted their present sentiments, since the commencement of this century. In that land of liberty, the accessions of congregations are numbered by dozens and scores each year; nor is there any limit to their future increase, except that which arises from the want of ministers to supply the new churches with preaching as fast as they are opened. Every religious newspaper that reaches this country, and almost every traveller who returns from America, whether friendly or adverse to the cause of Unitarianism, bears testimony to its progress. As to the fact, all are agreed; the only difference is, that some regard it, and speak of it, as a misfortune, and others hail it as a blessing.

"If we pass to the Continent of Europe, we turn first to Germany; where the Churches of Lutheranism have, in many instances, renounced the doctrines of the great Reformer, and embraced sentiments so nearly concurring with our own, that it would be difficult to draw a line of distinction between them. It is true, that some have gone farther, and have renounced belief in Christianity as a divine revelation; but all accounts agree in assuring us, that this defection is by no means so extensive as was some time ago supposed; and that many of those persons who were at first captivated by the daring novelty of the anti-supernatural scheme, are returning to sounder views. One thing is certain, that in Germany, the old Orthodoxy is extinct. Even the Orthodoxy of those who are the most orthodox among the living men of Germany, is not the Orthodoxy of the ancient creeds. If by Lutheranism, we understand the doctrines which Luther himself held and preached, it is vanished from the earth, and is no where to be found.

"In Switzerland, the case is, in many instances, the same. I cannot but regret to find, that the Canton of Vaud—once the most Orthodox in the confederation—has enacted a severe law to restrain the emissaries employed by the English fanatical association, called the Continental Society, from preaching within its territory. Their efforts, indeed, were chiefly directed to the sowing of dissension between the people and their regular pastors; still they should have been allowed free scope, for it cannot be doubted, that reason and truth will finally prevail. But while I visit this act for the suppression of Orthodox preaching, with deserved censure, I must declare my unqualified approval of another act of the same legislature, by which subscription to the old Confession of Faith is for ever abolished in the Canton of Vaud. The church of this populous

and enlightened canton is now therefore what the Presbytery of Antrim has been for upwards of a century; and all experience shows, that if such a change does not begin in Unitarianism, it is certain, sooner or later, to end there.

"Unitarianism is triumphant in the church and city of Geneva—the chosen abode of the renowned John Calvin—the spot which witnessed the martyrdom of Servetus; and heard the fiendish laugh that greeted his consignment to the flames.

"Unitarianism is making progress among the Protestants of France. The leading men in two of the principal Consistories, or Presbyteries of the kingdom—those of Paris and Lyons—have come forward to avow their adoption of its tenets; and have founded a periodical work, intended to illustrate, defend, and explain its principles for the information of their countrymen. France, the native country of Calvin, is experiencing the change which has already been experienced by the land of his adoption.

"And Holland, the land which saw assembled within its bosom the unholy and persecuting Synod of Dort,—which witnessed the legal murder of Barnevald,—and heard the sentence of perpetual imprisonment pronounced against Grotius and Hoogerbeets;—Holland, which beheld so many of its best citizens punished by fine, imprisonment, exile, and other marks of ignominy, because they did not submit to the sentence of the Synod, which silenced the ministers of the Remonstrants from preaching;—Holland has itself adopted the maxims of the party which once it persecuted, and, as far as it could, destroyed. In Holland, the churches have been released from the necessity of subscribing the decrees of Dort; and religious truth is, in consequence, advancing with rapid strides. The Remonstrants kindled a light in Holland which is now enlightening the whole land.

"It is needless to go farther into these details. It may suffice to know, that in every country where the profession of religion is free, Unitarianism exists largely; that in Holland, Switzerland, France and Germany, it is professed by probably not less than one half of all those who have renounced the Church of Rome; that every where it is making progress; every where it is steadily on the increase.

"Were it consistent with our views to glory in the men who have espoused our cause, we have names whereof we might be proud. Milton, Newton, Locke, Chandler, Lardner, Taylor, Priestley, Price, Rees, and Rammohun Roy, are men of whom any denomination in the world might be proud. Could I bring myself to name living men, I might extend the list. A late Archbishop of Dublin called our faith a feeble and conceited heresy! Feeble and conceited Archbishop Magee! Sir Isaac Newton is pronounced by Archbishop Magee to have espoused a feeble and conceited heresy! I fearlessly leave it to all men who know what these epithets mean, to pronounce which of the two—the Archbishop himself, or Sir Isaac Newton—is best entitled to bear them. The advocates of Unitarianism are pronounced by Dr. Chalmers to be men of pygmy understanding. Yes: such pygmies as Milton and Locke; such pygmies as Lardner and Priestley; and no doubt, compared

with these, Dr. Chalmers himself will appear, in the eyes of many, as a giant in intellect! I confess, however, that I am not of this opinion; and think that even Dr. Chalmers himself would have shown discretion, as well as courtesy, had he spoken of such men with a little more respect.

* * * * * *

"The inference from all this is—that Unitarianism has a progressive character; that its advance is not owing to the influence of worldly power, law, force, or authority; that it has reached its present position in spite of persecution, penalties, and disabilities—in spite of clamour, invective, and misrepresentation; that it has made its way by the force of reason, argument, and truth—illustrated by the learning, adorned by the lives, and dignified by the heroic fortitude of its advocates; that it has commanded the assent of the men of the most capacious intellect whom our race has ever produced; that it is still upon the advance—on, and on, and on, is its motto; forward, forward it goes, conquering and to conquer. We see the signs of the times are in many places favourable—the fields are ready for the harvest. We pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth labourers into his harvest. We feel all joy and confidence in the prospect which lies before us. We believe that our counsel and our work are of God—and we know that it is not in the power of man to overthrow it. Were our faith a falling and a sinking cause—as its enemies are so fond of repeating—this would be no reason to desert it, or to relax our endeavours for its support. In such circumstances, a good Christian would no more think of abandoning his profession than a gallant soldier would of deserting his standard when the tide of battle rolled most furiously against it. But there is still an increase of energy and activity gained from beholding that past exertions have not been made in vain. An impression has been made. The banner of truth has in some places been carried triumphantly through the contest. The fears of the enemy, as evinced by their clamour and impotent rage, are a proof of the progress it has already made, and a measure of their sense of the effects it is capable of producing. Let then the friends of the cause be earnest, instant, indefatigable, and there is reason to anticipate the most favourable results."

We have taken a great liberty with this Lecture; we have literally almost transferred it to our pages. Once more we recommend the whole work, as the very best we are acquainted with, for popular purposes. It cannot be circulated without conveying the truth it manifests to the convictions of many,—nor, what is infinitely more important, without awakening moral life within the soul, and nourishing the springs of personal religion.

## Art. III.—WHAT AM I TO BELIEVE?

### No. I.

It is a remarkable fact in the history of advancing knowledge, that every new Truth is resisted by those who, under the sanction of civil law, have assumed the direction of mankind in religious affairs. The resistance seems to be proportional to the palpability, increasing in the ratio of clearness of demonstration. It would appear that Truth is held in terror by the men styled spiritual guides, and what is false cherished: but charity demands that we believe this, in very many cases, (it is feared not in all,) to arise from conscientiousness, which, when not guided by the senses or the intellect, is apt to be as tenacious of error as of Truth. They seem to measure the chance of man being saved, by the degree of influence they fancy they have a right to exercise over the human mind; and by the submission and prostration of the intellect, to whatever dogmas they may be pleased to invent, or pretend to twist out of the pure religion taught, in humble simplicity, by Jesus Christ. These remarks are not made in a spirit of vituperation, but of lamentation over the miserable state to which the minds of numbers of excellent persons are reduced by the influence of what, with regret, must be styled Jesuitical chicanery, and of pharisaical externals, of which modern Christianity appears alas! to consist. To censure such things, to hold them up to the detestation of good men, is not the result of an evil spirit of ill-will, but of an humble imitation of that spirit which exposed the Scribes and Pharisees of old, and denounced them, and the thraldom under which they had brought their countrymen to labour and to suffer— of a desire to thrust buyers and sellers out of the temple.

Priests began by sacrificing animals and making libations, to flatter or appease the Deity; and even human beings were sacrificed. When our part of the world became too wise to endure this, the offering next demanded by the priest, was that of the human understanding, which he sacrificed with the leaden club of ignorance; sending back the spirit to its Maker, unenlightened by the book of knowledge which God had made and opened; and disfigured and degraded from the rank which He had designed it to attain. Long were the leaves of the book, in which it was said everlasting happiness was to be found, glued together by the mead of superstition; and when some master minds attempted to moisten and separate them, and succeeded in exhi-

biting but a glimpse of Truth, a dungeon or the stake was their lot.

In our day, in our, so called, happy land, in the land which boasts to be the cradle of liberty, what is the lot of the man who dares to say, "The eyes of the people shall be opened?" He is held up to the unhappy beings whom their spiritual guides have made the slaves of their dogmas, as one who, if listened to, will unfit them for Heaven and prepare them for Hell. How is that man treated who dares to say, "In the Bible I find no such dogmas as those you wish me to embrace; they are contradicted by it, as well as by every thing discovered to be an established law of nature?" He is denounced as a poisoner, a corrupter of the mind; and it is declared that his purpose is not to disseminate Truth, but to undermine and overthrow religion!—as if this were in the power of man! He is reviled and abused, not because he may hold certain dogmas to be false, but because Churchmen feel that the unchristian domination which they exercise must cease, the moment when Education shall have unfolded Truth to the ignorant.

Much has been said of the evils attending an established church; and perhaps the only one of great importance is, that the necessity for a creed being formed, and adhered to, shuts out all possibility of error in the adopted creed being acknowledged, though it may be felt. Right or wrong, young priests must adopt what is demanded by old priests backed by the law: they must forfeit all liberty of conscience; and in their turn propagate and hand down a dogmatic creed as it was invented by their predecessors, no matter whether it be founded on just views and interpretations, or otherwise. Men thus bound down, become careless of investigating truth; their minds imperceptibly arrive at a condition (which they nevertheless deny) that imposes on them an obligation to resist the demonstration of Truth, whenever it may show to be false, the deductions drawn by the church from unwarranted interpretations; and to hold up these as of such sanctity that, to impeach them, to impeach the doctrines of men, incurs the penalty of expulsion and damnation. Here we may also perceive the origin of the pretended love for old metaphysical systems of mental philosophy, and the reasons for keeping the mind from being too curious, by means of Greek and Latin, and academical honours, as they are called. It must happen that some minds come to be united with the profession of a churchman, which are powerful enough to perceive that these systems and Truth do not go hand in hand. It is seen, however, that, while unfounded on any tangible and true principle, such systems are

admirably calculated to occupy powerful minds, and to divert them from the paths in which Truth is likely to be found. To keep every thing like true and just Philosophy out of the schools, seems to be the avowed aim of the church establishments of the present day. They will use every effort to prevent attacks on their dogmas being read, but not a member of them will stir a finger to refute the honest expression of honest opinion. They know that there are yet in the world multitudes of weak minds, ready to take for granted whatever they may please to say of a book or of its author; and small is the courage which Truth and Honesty inspire, if an author can be annoyed at this time by the puny hostility of men who pervert pure Christianity, and give that name to a yoke of ignorance, that has bent the neck of humanity to the dust. It is forgotten that Christianity was propagated by its founder to elevate the human character, to enlighten human understanding, and to point out the way for man to approach the Perfection which created him. Pure Christianity cannot fail to produce such effects: but the so-called Christianity that tends to render man wretched by degrading him in his own eyes must fail.

We might not, perhaps, feel so hostile to church establishments, were they not exclusive, and bound down to abstain from the improvement of religious creeds, when the discovery of Truth may authorize it, and to resist Truth when known. Were Churchmen not nursed in prejudice, not enlisted in the service of dogmatism; were they free to regard their predecessors as not entitled to exclusive wisdom, to exercise their own powers in separating the chaff from the wheat; were they free to allow to laymen the privilege of interpreting and assisting to arrive at just views of Christianity; could they look, without jealousy and envy, on the efforts of freely-educated men, and permit those who aspired to the sacred office to be freely educated; then there might be harmony, peace and good-will to men, and acceptable service to the God of all; then might establishments be supported, and be serviceable because reasonable. Differences of opinion might then be maintained without rancour, and argued without hostility or personality; Power and wealth would cease to be the aims and idols of those called to teach meekness and humility. They would do unto others, as they would that others should do unto them, and they would love their neighbour as themselves. At the present time Christian morality is a dead letter, and vague idealism is made the anchor of hope: Faith is founded on abstraction, and Charity is pushed to the wall.

A review of the doctrines contained in the Westminster Con-

fession of Faith, which is the creed of the churches in Great Britain distinguished by having the support of legislative authority, and of the points of difference subsisting between those who hold fast by the established Churches and those who dissent from them, together with a general view of the religious state of the whole world, have led the writer of these pages to ask himself the question he has taken as a title to the expression of his thoughts. It is a question of great moment to the well-being of individuals and of society; for, until mankind shall have been so well instructed as to be able to perceive the Law of God connecting all creation, and to resolve to obey that law, there will be no end to unprofitable religious controversy. Priests have denied to man the exercise of reason in matters connected with religion. On what ground this denial is made is not easily perceived; it is, however, proper to inquire whether man has a just right to apply his reasoning powers, in ascertaining on what authority Divines have declared belief in certain doctrines to be necessary to salvation.

God has made man, and given to him a definite constitution. We are accustomed to divide that constitution into two parts, distinguished by the terms corporeal and mental. These two parts are most intimately blended together: and the state of the one most materially affects the state of the other. In the mental part of the human constitution are certain faculties or powers, the operations of which are made manifest to others by action and speech. These operations are known to the individual man by what is termed consciousness; but this does not make known to him by what means he is enabled to call mental power into action. The consciousness of possessing certain powers leads us to exert them in order to discover the source from which they are derived; and the steps by which we ascend to the Great First Cause, or arrive at any conclusion drawn from observation and reflection, are the operations of certain faculties denoted by the term reason. Reason distinguishes man from other created beings—not that they are totally devoid of mental power, and that man is the exclusive possessor of it—but that he possesses the powers constituting reason in a degree very far above that which can be claimed for inferior creatures. This distinction has been bestowed by God;—an affirmation which will not be denied, though it is sometimes kept out of sight, by those who do not choose the world to be too curious in examining the natural revelations of the Creator. Reason has been given to man for the purpose of guiding him to discover God in his works, to perceive the laws impressed on all

nature, and to prompt him to obey those laws for the sake of the happiness which obedience ensures.

The laws of nature, which are the laws of God, are arranged in three classes in reference to man and his position. The first class comprehends the Physical laws—those which regulate what are termed material substances, giving them certain qualities and properties, so that when two or more of them meet and are combined under every circumstance and condition, certain definite effects uniformly follow, and no others.

In the second class are placed the Organic laws, or those which regulate material substances when combined in forms originally given to them by the Creator for special purposes, and endowed with life. Anything which disturbs function by obstructing action intended by the Creator to promote the growth and support of animal or vegetable structures, or their reproduction, is an infraction of the organic law.

The third class includes the Moral law, according to which mental operations connected with our relations to God and our fellow-creatures ought to be regulated, so that our speech and actions may not be disrespectful to the author of our being, nor injurious to our fellow-men. Our reasoning powers enable us to take into consideration all the probable results of a course of action, and when these come before the faculty which takes cognizance of right and wrong, it directs, or ought to direct, our conduct. The moral feelings or sentiments, assisted and directed by the reasoning powers, are intended to govern all other faculties, and their operation is known by what is termed conscience.

It becomes obvious to those who study nature, that God governs the world by Physical, Organic, and Moral laws, the infringement of any of which inevitably brings punishment, in some shape or other, on the defaulter. This, then, being the system of God's government, and as no other being could have bestowed upon us powers to guide ourselves during the term of life, it cannot be affirmed that God has done anything in vain —that He has given powers, but enjoined us not to employ them. If He has implanted reason in the human frame to give us power over creation, by enabling us to search for and discover the laws by which all things are governed, it seems impossible that the use of the same power to determine what is true and what is false, in reference to God himself, should be prohibited. Reason enables us to say, that a man who affirms that he must be believed at once, without any inquiry on our part, and without any proof of veracity on his, is an impostor.

Reason also tells us, that a man who offers proof that what he affirms is true, is worthy of being listened to. Proof is what reason requires; and on the sufficiency of proof it depends whether reason will admit of belief.

Belief may be considered in two points of view; as arising from conviction, after the exercise of the faculties; or from a predisposition in some of the faculties to receive as true that which may be agreeable to them, without the other powers having been consulted. The former is termed rational, the latter blind belief. This last also arises from an impression of the character of the individual, who offers a proposition for assent, being such as to render it unlikely that he would knowingly offer a falsehood. The character supposed to be attached to the priesthood is calculated to disarm suspicion in minds that are indisposed for exertion, or incapable of effort; and the power which those who have assumed an exclusive authority in sacred things have gained, has been acquired from the indolence or weakness of their fellow-men, whom they find too much involved in secular and selfish pursuits, to hesitate in committing their concerns with God to the hands of a distinct profession, just as worldly concerns are committed to attorneys. Experience, however, becomes more extensive as the world gets older, and the human powers become stronger, and less disposed to be dependent. It is known that the love of influence leads to abuse; and superior minds perceive that it is not accordant with the most precious gift of God, to yield blindly to men who, sincere though they may be, yet have got into habits, and come under obligations, that prevent them from exercising reason, and lead them to expect that others are to suppress the most useful faculties of their minds. This cannot be agreeable to the God of Truth, who has given us our powers for the express purpose of discovering it.

The exercise of reason seems to be peculiarly demanded when any thing is presented to us claiming divine authority. The mere *ipse dixit* of a man is not enough in such a case. It is a duty incumbent upon us, not to run the risk of displeasing God by adopting, as emanating from Him, the inventions of man. We may escape this risk by the means which He has bestowed upon us for the purpose—by calling into action our Reason, and by its help applying all acquired knowledge in testing the genuineness of what may be offered to us as divine. We have seen moral precept and example, immoral example, impudent assumption, gross falsehood, physical force, all effective in establishing religious systems; but scarcely, even in the case of moral preaching, has reason been addressed; the appeal

having been made for the most part to the feelings; any semblance of reasoning being resolvable into begging of the question. There is scarcely any religious discussion in which we do not find that which ought to be proved taken as granted; and reasoning in a circle appears to the multitude as something very profound. Those who deny the right of man to employ reason in religious matters, in doing so proclaim one of two facts; either that they themselves have not made use of it, and are therefore blind guides; or that, having made use of it, they wish others to be deceived: for, if reason bears them out, it must also bear others out, and therefore is not to be feared.—The time seems now to have arrived when the commencement has taken place of a full exposure, by means of reason, of the manner in which God has been dishonoured by attributing to Him that which would disgrace a man. Such considerations have led us to consider, whether the doctrines that have been given out as founded on just inferences from what is contained in the Bible, be correctly drawn from that source. We are aware that the plenary inspiration of the Bible is denied by many excellent persons; but we are not aware that any examination of the doctrines contained in the Confession of Faith has been made in the manner here adopted. We must be assisted here by the study of human nature; and we believe that the system of religion which shall be found adapted to that nature must be the true religion—that which is acceptable to the Creator. The religion which demands a prostration of the mental powers, so far from doing honour to God, places Him in a point of view from which a mind elevated by moral sentiment turns with disgust. Moral sentiment guided by reason, exhibits God as a being to be adored and loved. Let us then see whether the Confession of Faith displays such a character of God as commands adoration and love.

The first chapter of the Confession treats of "The Holy Scripture." This appellation is given, and the whole chapter proceeds on a *petitio principii*. It is taken as granted that the Scripture is given of God. It is admitted by the divines, unreservedly, that the light of Nature leaves that man inexcusable, who does not perceive, by looking at that light, that God has established laws for the government of His creatures, which they are bound at their peril to obey. But they deny that the light of nature is "sufficient to give that knowledge of God and His will which is necessary unto salvation." These few words involve a great deal that requires examination. There is a necessity for Salvation expressed: but nothing is said respecting the meaning of Salvation, nor of that which is sup-

posed to render it necessary. He who composed the sentence makes it appear that before the Scripture was written and delivered, this Salvation was necessary; and he goes on to say, "therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times, and in divers manners, to reveal Himself, and to declare, His will, unto His Church; and afterwards for the better perceiving and propagating of the Truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church against the corruption of the flesh and of the malice of Satan, and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing, which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary: those former ways of revealing His will unto His people being now ceased." Here is a distinct enunciation of an alleged fact, without the slightest intimation of whence the knowledge of it was derived; or how it came to be known that the books presented for our acceptance, and called in their collected form the Bible, were actually written and promulgated by God. Our purpose is not to enter on that question at present; but to show what are the necessary inferences from such statements in relation to the attributes of God. These attributes afford the only real tests of Truth in respect to all that is offered to us as coming from God, and to the rationality of all such averments as that before us.

The first assumption in the passages quoted is, that Salvation is something ultimate, to the attainment of which, as a thing desirable, a knowledge of God's will is necessary; and it might have been added, obedience to that will. Salvation is a term which, in the present discussion, must be held to mean that man is, by some fatality, certainly to be destroyed, unless he follow some course by which he may save himself. A preliminary question, therefore exists, viz., What is it that places man in such a condition? The answer, we are told, is to be found in the Bible. But in this way we are thrown back on the question that demands a proof that God himself is the author of the Bible, and not man. If the light of nature be sufficient to make man fully aware of the existence of a Supreme Being, and of the laws which that Being has established, he is surely entitled, when any thing else is affirmed to have been communicated, and that out of the ordinary course of nature, to demand proof of such affirmation. We are told there is no proof but what the thing communicated can itself give, since we do not choose to take the word of the individual presenting it. This again throws us back upon the light which we have derived from God's works, and that portion of it shed on His attributes; and it becomes, therefore, necessary to discover whether that which is offered to us as a further revelation of

God's will be consistent with what He has already revealed, and with His attributes. There appears, therefore, on a single glance at the Confession of Faith, and indeed at any system of religion whatever, a wide field of research opened up; so very wide as almost at once to account for the indolence of men respecting inquiry, and for their preference of allowing priests to have their own way; and also for the blind belief that has got hold of the public mind, respecting the most important subjects that can occupy human attention.

The first doctrine stated in the Confession of Faith, is that of the Trinity. Enough, one would think, has been written on this subject; and to those who cannot see the inconsistency of maintaining there is but one God, while they worship three Gods, as is done in the Liturgy of the English Church, and more particularly at the commencement of the Litany, it would be a waste of time to offer any argument. We may, however, observe, that the word begotten, which is used as a distinctive mark of one of the persons in the Trinity, has not been sufficiently considered. Every one knows what the word means in its ordinary acceptation; and if it be used in reference to Jesus in that acceptation, it is obvious that his equality with God cannot be maintained. What is meant by the expression used in the Confession of Faith, *eternally* begotten, is beyond comprehension. If the Son was produced by the Father in any way whatever, there must of necessity be separation and inferiority. If the word begotten be used in its usual sense, it then appears to us to be so utterly at variance with the attributes of the Creator, as to be blasphemous. If there be any other sense attached to it, it would be better to use another term that should not be misunderstood.

As Jesus himself explains his own expressions as not being used to indicate that he was God or equal to Him, it is singular that such a doctrine as that of the Trinity should have been invented to escape from imaginary difficulties. Alluding to himself, Jesus said, "neither is he that is sent greater than he that sent him."—"I have kept my Father's commandments." The clearest explanation of what he wished to express when he said, "I and my Father are one," is found in his prayer recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John's Gospel: "That they *all* may be *one, as* thou Father art in me and I in Thee, that *they* also may be *one* in *us*; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." If the disciples were to be one in God and Christ, as Christ is one in God, according to the acceptation of the passage by the Trinitarians, then they, in whose behalf Christ prayed to the Father, must be considered (supposing the

prayer to have been granted) as persons in the Godhead, and equal with God, and therefore worthy of worship. But the Trinitarians will not go so far. The explanation in the above passage is clear, that when Christ said he and the Father were one, he meant that the will of the Father being accomplished by him, a perfect agreement subsisted between them, and in that sense they were one; and so are all that strictly learn and do the will of God. These considerations alone appear quite sufficient to satisfy any one in whom the love of mystery does not overpower the judgment. Those who wish to inquire further may consult the writings of the respective sects.

The third chapter of the Confession treats of what is called "God's Eternal Decree." The substance of this doctrine is stated in eight propositions, every one of them founded on a *petitio principii*, that what is quoted from scripture is not only true in itself, but capable of bearing the construction put upon it, and that this construction is the only true one. The first proposition is this; "God, from all eternity, did, by the most wise and holy council of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures; nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established."

That God has the power to fix the destiny of all created things, is not to be denied. But viewing His moral attributes, we may consider whether His so fixing a destiny upon all things would be consistent with them, or calculated to gratify his wisdom, which is infinite. It is not by our own will that we exist; nor do we confer upon ourselves those feelings and propensities which prompt our actions, nor those rational powers which ought to regulate them. Existence and its concomitants are conferred by the Creator. If God be a benevolent and just Being, it is impossible to believe that He called any creature into existence for the *express purpose* of rendering its life miserable, its death painful, or of conferring a second state of existence to be one of everlasting torment. It may be believed that God bestowed existence conditionally, and left man to choose between the consequences of fulfilling and not fulfilling the conditions. This belief is consistent with the wisdom, the benevolence and the justice of the Supreme Being. But to say he ordained that certain individual creatures should fulfil, and that certain others should not fulfil the conditions, and be subject to penalties which they had no power to avoid, is to deny to God the best feelings of humanity, and cannot be believed without incurring the charge of blasphemy. To escape this imputation by affirm-

ing that, notwithstanding God having ordained that some should commit sin in spite of themselves, "He is nevertheless not the author of sin," is the same in amount, morally speaking, as if a man were to dig a pit into which his neighbour should fall, and not be held responsible for the injury inflicted. When the expression, God is not the author of sin, is used in its plain meaning, detached from the consideration of doctrine, no man, who has a share of moral sense, can refuse his assent to it. Yet the expression is not a correct one; for sin is not an abstract principle, nor a principle at all. It is the general term for immoral actions and sayings that are disrespectful to God. That man is sinful is an effect, not of God's will, but of the abuse of His gifts by the creature, within whose reach he placed happiness as the result of obedience to His established laws; and with perfectly benevolent design, God prepared punishment for the breach of them, and which inevitably follows, in some shape, sinful, and even what are termed careless actions. This view is not only compatible with moral sentiment and observation, but with an explanation of the extent to which the term predestination may be carried. If God has established creation, and added man to it *on condition* that if he be obedient he shall reap benefit, if disobedient he shall experience punishment, there is a fixed determination on the part of the Almighty that such condition shall be fulfilled, or otherwise that certain consequences shall be the result of non-fulfilment: this may be called predestination or decreeing. But to say that God had from all eternity determined to bring certain individuals into existence, that He might compel them to disobey His laws, others that He might favour them by opposite treatment, is to affirm so great a breach of morals on the part of the Deity, as to blot out justice and benevolence from among His attributes, and to remove from beings endowed with moral sense, all inducement to worship Him.

The second proposition is, "Although God knows whatsoever may or can come to pass upon all supposed conditions, yet hath He not decreed anything because He foresaw it as future, or as that which would come to pass upon such conditions."

There is an obscurity in this which seems to arise from the divines having had a glimpse of the risk, involved in their doctrine, of imputing to the Deity the want of wisdom and justice. It seems to mean that, if God foresaw that certain events would happen, there was no need for His decreeing that they should happen; that whatever He decreed to happen, would not happen, under any circumstances, contrary to His will. They appear anxious to free God from necessity—that is, supposing He had

established certain laws for matter and mind, the ordinary and certain results of their operation might be interfered with, in particular cases, by His decree; so that He might determine that things should happen, not because He foresaw them, but willed them. This, however, does not clear up the mystery, nor remove the imputations laid on the character of the Deity by the doctrine; nor does it prepare us for

The third and fourth propositions; "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestined unto everlasting life, and others pre-ordained unto everlasting death."

"These angels and men thus predestinated and fore-ordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished."

To an ordinary understanding, such affirmations lower the moral character of the Deity, substituting injustice and wanton cruelty for justice and mercy. They completely destroy another doctrine, that this life is a state of probation, which it cannot possibly be if the fate of every individual be irrevocably fixed. There is something degrading also in

The fifth proposition; "Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret council and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen, in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of Faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature as conditions, or causes moving Him thereunto, and all to the praise of His Glorious Grace."

Besides assuming that God acts blindly, without cause, without the impulse of His perfect goodness, this proposition would, if admitted, fix on the Almighty Creator the most childish caprice and vanity. It declares that God pays no regard to those who obey his laws, or to those who do not, but grants to certain individuals the highest favour, and dooms certain others to destruction, simply because He wills to do so for the purpose of His grace being praised—Praised?—By whom? By beings doomed to destruction, however carefully they may exert themselves to do His will? Does God need any praise? He has manifested His glory in other ways, not to gain praise—but to gratify His own benevolence and justice. We shall be able to see into the doctrine more clearly, if we proceed to the remaining propositions.

The sixth states, "As God hath appointed the Elect unto

Glory, so hath He, by the eternal and most free purpose of His will, fore-ordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ, are effectually called into faith in Christ by His spirit working in due season, are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by His power through Faith unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified and saved, but the Elect only."

Seventh; "The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy, as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice."

The sixth proposition involves a matter of importance, viz., that the eternal decree is not supposed to have come into operation until the appearance of Christ, and also that it operates only where Christianity is known and adopted. It is not easy to see how an eternal and irrevocable decree of God could require any thing future to give it effect—any means to secure its fulfilment in any particular whatever. The will of God having had it recorded from all eternity, that certain persons were to be made eternally happy, and certain others eternally miserable, it surely needed nothing to render the chosen worthy of being chosen, or the condemned worthy of condemnation. This doctrine forestals another supposed to be necessary to the fulfilment of the pretended eternal decree, viz. the fall of Adam and the corruption of human nature. But as it is affirmed that Christ came into the world to save it from the consequences of Adam's transgression, and that salvation depends on the acceptance of Christ as a redeemer, it may be asked, how could there be a fall, or a salvation from its effects, in the face of an eternal decree? This is a contradiction, and an imputation against the wisdom of God. To say that Christ took away the sin of the world—the guilt incurred by Adam's posterity, is just saying that Christ restored things to the state they were in before Adam's fall. That state being, according to the Divines, one under the eternal decree, of what avail, it is asked, could Christ's appearance be? He did not come to redeem the elect, because they were the elect before the foundations of the world were laid, and nothing could prevent their being saved, it being impossible that their number can be increased or diminished. He did not come to redeem the condemned, for the same reasons, their number having been also fixed. Who, then, are the redeemed by Christ? None. This doctrine clearly admits that, in consequence of

Adam's guilt, the elect were equally involved in its consequences with the condemned. Thus the grossest injustice is imputed to God, in making all equally guilty, and yet rewarding guilt in some, and punishing it in others.—The seventh proposition is extraordinary; for if men be fore-ordained to be punished for sin, they must necessarily have been fore-ordained to commit sin; and that this should have been deemed worthy of the glorious justice of God, indicates a prodigious preponderance of feeling over intellect, in those who could propound to the world a doctrine that frees man from responsibility, and holds up God as a capricious, cruel, and senseless being! As if a glimpse of the consequences rationally arising out of their doctrine had been caught by the oppressed intelligence of the wondering and bewildered divines, whose own destructive feelings joined to an imagination that they themselves were assuredly elected, they concluded this part of their confession with the eighth and last proposition. "The doctrine of this high mystery of predestination is to be handled with special prudence and care, that men attending the will of God revealed in His word, and yielding obedience thereunto, may, from the certainty of their effectual vocation, be assured of their eternal election. So shall this doctrine afford matter of praise, reverence, and admiration of God, and of humility, diligence, and abundant consolation to all that sincerely obey the gospel." To conclude that men by obedience may be certain of effectual vocation, after taking vast pains to declare that whether men obey or not, their destiny has been fixed from all eternity, does not make it appear that the divines were disposed to use the prudence and care which they recommended to others. Am I to believe this doctrine or not? I cannot believe anything that darkens the slightest ray proceeding from the glorious attributes of God.

S.

ART. IV.—ONE TRACT MORE, OR THE SYSTEM ILLUSTRATED BY "THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES," EXTERNALLY REGARDED. By a Layman. London: Rivingtons.

THIS 'One Tract More,' is attributed to Mr. Monckton Milnes, a gentleman who in some volumes of poetry, whatever may be thought of their power, has given proof of the possession of the true ethereal temperament, and of a gentle and generous spirit. Mr. Milnes is a reputed Tory and Puseyite,—a Tory, however, rather of the literary than of the political class, an æsthetic Tory, a lover of quiet, of order, of antiquity, fearful of change because it is tumultuary and rears an upstart spirit, in the insolence of its self-confidence, disdainful of the solemn and mighty Past,—and a Puseyite, for much the same æsthetic reasons, because too refined for an Evangelical,—too earnest and spiritual for a Church and King man,—and too much a worshipper of the outward, too sensitive to Art and all external impressions, too enamoured of Cathedrals and the vague solemnities of Authority, for a Dissenter. Where indeed in the Establishment is there a nook of refuge for religious minds of Mr. Milnes' order except in Puseyism, and how comfortless and unconfiding must have been their repose upon her bosom, until the Catholicism of the English Church began to develop itself? The Evangelical Clergy are Churchmen only by accident; Salvation by Doctrines is the essence of their Christianity, and the external administration the merest circumstantial; and the narrowness in which all the evidences of the true spirit of Christianity in the soul are reduced by them to one spiritual experience, must revolt all philosophic and Catholic minds. The High Church party, however moral and sincerely devoted to the Ethics of Christianity, are rather a religious police than a spiritual Church. With them the Church is subordinate to the purposes of the State, and Religion is not an independent interest of the soul, the supreme affection and authority. With a merely doctrinal Church assimilating in all essentials with the Evangelical Dissenters, or with a merely ethical and political Church in which spiritual life and its developments are not the supreme concern, minds of Mr. Milnes' class can have but little sympathy. They desire earnestness, spirituality, fervour, the acknowledged supremacy of the religious affections, in combination with all artistical and imaginative influences, with a mystic ceremonial, a consecrated priesthood, a traditional authority. An intense life in the in-

ward affections, with external provisions for repose and security, and the absence of Doubt, are the demands of such minds. The living action of the Heart, and the voluntary stillness and inaction of the Intellect, is their *desideratum* in Religion;—an impossible requirement. For such minds Puseyism (we follow Mr. Milnes in our use of the word) provides but an airy and temporary habitation. The Intellect never long consents to be a sleeping partner in spiritual concerns. It will awake and disturb the Heart, demanding harmony between the affections and the powers of thought. The proper sphere for such minds is, we will not say Dissent, for that is negative, and moreover would only suggest some one of the existing forms of Dissent, but independence in Religion, freedom for individual development; the Religion, not of an external Church but of an inward soul; the authority, not of an arbitrary and undefinable era in ecclesiastical history, but of the spiritual nature quickened into the intensest sympathy with Christianity, and speaking as with the spirit of the Lord. It is unmanly and effeminate for such minds to cling to the Authority and Catholicism of the Church; not because their Intellect and higher powers are lifted to God, but because their Imagination is awed and soothed, and the lowest class of the rational faculties artistically affected. Dissent requires minds like Mr. Milnes' to bring into it, Grace, and Art, and all the æsthetic influences in which it may be deficient; and no less does Mr. Milnes, and men of his order, require the freedom and individuality of Dissent, to set the Intellect at peace with the Imagination, to baptize the *whole* higher being into Religion, and to feed the Heart and the Imagination by the highest powers of thought. Authority, in the sense of Infallibility, such minds do not require: it has been an accidental accompaniment of the artistical and poetic influences which have been their essential demands. It would be a noble mission for such minds, intensely religious, and at the same time intensely ideal and imaginative, to unite all the powers of the soul in the worship of God, to reconcile Grace with Truth in Christianity, and with individual liberty to associate the Heart's indispensable demands for the solemn, the tender, and the lovely. Would to God they would break through their cobweb Catholicism and manfully take it up!

Mr. Milnes declares that he has taken up the defence of the Anglo-Catholics because they are prohibited from defending themselves. Now that "the expression of the desire of a single Bishop" has arrested the series of 'Tracts for the Times,' "a layman offers apologetically to public notice this 'One Tract more'." We do not understand, on his own principles, with what consis-

tency a layman, any more than a clergyman, can hold himself justified in disregarding episcopal divines. Mr. Milnes, as a good Anglo-Catholic, should have observed that submissive silence which his religious guides and superiors have not dared to break. Shall a layman intrude where Priests are forbidden to venture? Neither can we find that safety to the commonwealth which Mr. Milnes discovers in that "element of unconditional submission to ecclesiastical rule which will effectually check any extravagant excursions of individual fancy, and any illegitimate assumption of individual will." In the collisions and corrections of "individual wills," we could find the proper protections against individual fancies and individual tyranny,—but in an "unconditional submission to ecclesiastical rule," we can only see a whole nation prostrate before the fancy and the will of a few individuals,—our only security being that the Bishops still retain *their* individualities, and possess, upon this subject, conflicting fancies and discordant wills.

The professed object of this 'One Tract more,' is to supply a fair Criticism, presupposing no opinions, and implicating no doctrines, but simply inquiring into the true meaning of Puseyism, its relation to the past, its connection with the present, and its tendencies for the future. This task, however, is executed in the spirit of an advocate, rather than of a critic. The unity of the Church of England is at once abandoned, and the three parties into which it is split graphically delineated. Mr. Milnes, with a little more of oratorical artifice than can be natural to so earnest a mind, speaks of these as the "three very distinct aspects under which the Church of England shows itself to *different* minds,"—as if it was precisely the same object that produced these different impressions on different minds. But does not the *same* mind distinctly perceive these three parties in the Church? Mr. Milnes is an individual, yet he can see, so as very vividly to describe, these conflicting aspects in the uniformity of the Church; the Evangelical, or low Church; the Church and State, or High Church; and the Puseyite, or Catholic; and to show how clear to his individuality are the lines of demarcation, we shall give his own accurate and instructive descriptions.

"The Evangelical section necessarily feels a very subordinate interest in any part of Church history, which is not of a purely spiritual nature. Accustomed to study the sacred records themselves in a passive mood, and being far less anxious to realize the historical events with critical care, than to discover in each passage some secondary and suggestive meaning applicable to some known state of mind in themselves or others, the Church of the Fathers, of the Middle Ages, and even of the English Reformation, is little more to them than any other social institution. If

they do turn their attention that way, it is to follow out certain doctrines, or rather the single doctrine of justification by Faith, according to the prominence or obscurity of which the Church is held to be pure or polluted. The ministerial Functions and sacramental Ordinances of the Church are hardly necessary for the completeness of this religious system, which can with consistency only receive them as designating or exciting certain internal processes: neither can the ties of church-membership be very strong where the chief sympathy is with spiritual experiences, without relation to external communion. The English Church appears in truth, to such minds, but as a happy accident, a wise dispensation of Providence, showing forth, in a visible institution, the vital truth which is in the hearts of men. Thus with them the interest of the Reformation increases, the further it separates itself from the hierarchy of Rome, until it finds in Calvinism its complete exposition: thus too the early Puritan divines share, if they do not supersede, the attention given to the writings of the fathers of the English Reformation, and their favourite reading embraces a large range of subsequent Dissent, from Nonconformity to Methodism. In this point of view, therefore, the Church of England is simply useful as a public recognition of Christian faith, as ordering and facilitating the public offices of Christianity, and perhaps as preventing some other absolutely injurious or dangerous shape of hierarchical authority from occupying its position in this country.

"The High Church party in England has always comprised two very discrepant elements; the one secular and political, the other philosophical and religious. The theory of the former is what is usually called Erastianism: the Church is there the creature of the State—a high police, established by authority and organized by law. Accepting as a fact the religious desires and wants of the Community, it is requisite that some power should exist in every well-ordered society, which should provide at once for their satisfaction and discipline. In ancient Heathenism the State was in one sense the Church, and the worship of Minerva of the Parthenon, and of Capitoline Jove, was the most solemn act of citizenship, as the hereditary assumption of the Pontificate was the principal form of the imperial usurpation over the Roman world. Christianity, however, being from its very nature the religion of baptized men of all nations, a national Christianity seemed almost a contradiction in terms, and the Church and State could only be identified under such conditions of universal empire as the Popes of the middle ages attempted to carry into effect. If there was to be a fusion of the temporal and spiritual authorities, then, the spiritual authority being Catholic, the temporal authority must be Catholic also, and kingdoms and principalities must be held by the same tenure as ecclesiastical dignities and trusts. This experiment failed: the will and wit of mankind were never directed to so mighty an object, and the struggle continued through a large tract of History with more or less purity of motive, and more or less probability of success; but the practical truth seems gradually to have worked itself out, that all union of Church and State implies the subordination of the former to the latter. The mere doctrine of the Papal supremacy had no power to prevent this consequence, although it has been the most clearly demon-

strated in countries formally separated from the Roman See; the Spanish Inquisition was a State-tribunal, directing its violence towards political objects, such as the domination of the Spanish race over the Hebrew and the Moor, or the exclusion of those principles of individual freedom which the Reformation had aroused in Europe, far more than towards the preservation of doctrinal orthodoxy: in France the interests of the Church were generally but a veil for the supposed advantages of the State; the persecution of the Albigenses was carried on against the will of Innocent III. as the persecution of the Huguenots against the remonstrance of Innocent XI.; and the latter circumstance may remind the reader of the Prince of Condé's saying, that 'if Louis XIV. thought fit to go over to the Protestant Church, the clergy would be the first to follow him.' To a political high-churchman there is nothing objectionable in this state of things: regarding the State, whether represented by a King or a Parliament, as the only legitimate Source of Power, he looks on all resistance to it on the part of the Church as a priestly usurpation, on Dunstan and Becket as ambitious agitators, on the Reformation as the epoch of the recognition of the full and just rights of the State over the Church, and of the consequent Establishment by it of the Church of England, its powers and its privileges, according to the laws and customs of the nation. In this system it follows logically that the transmutation of the Church by Queen Mary, and its destruction later by the Parliament then supreme in England, were acts of exactly the same nature as its institution; and that any act of the legislature which has taken or may take place for altering, mutilating, or even annihilating the Church, is just as authoritative as that which raised it into constitutional existence; what the State can do, the State can undo; where the State can bind, there can she loosen. In this system the Church of England stands in relation to other Christian bodies, as the one decided by the State to be the best and purest form of Christianity, the doctrines of the Articles as selected to be the true exposition of Christian faith; its origin is but little earlier than the Zuinglian community (which among other peculiarities rejected baptism as an idolatry) settled by permission of the same authority, in London, in the fourth year of Edward the Sixth; its bishops are officials, which the State, in the person of Queen Elizabeth, might unfrock, or, in the person of King William, might deprive at pleasure, elected by a *congé d'elire* which makes the non-election misprision of treason, and consecrated at the absolute and undisguised command of the crown. Queen Elizabeth put to death the Roman Catholics who refused to acknowledge her supremacy over the Church, as the Roman Emperors martyred the Christians who refused to burn incense before their statues; in both cases it was a refusal to recognise religious, on the part of those who acknowledged secular, authority. It was too in this theory of the Church of England that the Continental Protestants nicknamed it *Parliament faith*, and that Melancthon mentions that the German Lutherans named those that had suffered for the reformed cause in England, *the Devil's Martyrs*.

"Of what constitutes Church-membership in this view no very dis-

tinct account can be given. A Bishop in the last century went the length of saying, that 'the Church of England included every man who believed in the divine mission of Christ;'—'a most expansive definition,' remarks de Maistre, 'seeing that it embraces the whole Mahometan world.' But these principles would in strictness require some political conditions as terms of communion, something analogous to the obligation of fealty to the Czar which the act of admission into the Russo-Greek Church imposes on all, whether infant or adult, native or alien. The use of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, as a test of political capacity, was of this kind; but, now that this practice is relaxed, and that even adherence to the Roman Church debars any man from only two or three offices of state, it is hardly clear what constitutes a member of the Church of England. Yet, although foreigners can join its communion, without becoming naturalized (and it is evident from Archbishop Wake's Formula for the reception of such persons, that such cases were anticipated), the general feeling among men of this way of thinking is that an Englishman is a member of the Church as he is a member of the State; that he pays his tithes and Church-rates as he pays his other taxes; that he attends the public worship as a profession as much of civic morality as religious duty; and that Church and State, or Church and King, have at least co-ordinate claims on his devotional regard.

"The practical atheism reconcileable with this system, and in fact reconciled with it by Hobbes, has naturally embarrassed many religious minds, who have taken refuge in the speculation of a State-Conscience, of something in the state itself of a religious nature, and involving religious responsibilities. In this view the State has duties to the Church which it must fulfil under penalty of national sin, and will consequently assist and co-operate with the Church instead of oppressing or hampering it. The idealization of the State in the ancient World, as the great object of patriotic devotion and personal sacrifice, contained much of this principle, and in those times we find the combination of Church and State in the same authority, very practicable and successful. But the Conscience which Christianity deals with is of a character so much higher and finer, that the question becomes very complicated. The Christian requirement is of virtuous motives as well as actions. Now a motive implies a will, and the State must have one clear and absolute will before it can have a Conscience. An absolute king, reigning of divine right, might, in some sense, represent the Conscience of the nation which merely followed his bidding; for, if resistance to his authority were a crime, he must take on himself the responsibility of enforcing that authority, and thus his individual conscience would become the conscience of the State. But if an act of the State be nothing more than a result evolved from a number of discordant wills, by certain constitutional processes in which the wills of the minority are by mutual consent submitted to those of the majority, to regard the act as that of one intelligent responsible Will, is surely rather fanciful than philosophical. No possible process can give one pure and free Will as the sum total of a series of discrepant wills, or bring one simple Conscience out of a

confusion of discordant consciences. In the present aspect of political affairs throughout the Christian world, perhaps no doctrine could be started less practicable for the resolution of difficulties, or more beset with embarrassments, than this one of a State-Conscience. Now that, without any recurrence to the foolish philanthropy of the French Revolution, the thoughtful youth of this generation are drawn together from many lands by a sympathy of civilization of which the old patriotism knew nothing; when excessive and exclusive nationality is no longer an object of admiration; when governments are at issue with all Churches which they have not subdued, or from which they have not detached themselves; when men become daily more impatient of anomalous offices, irreconcileable duties, and dead-letter titles; when all political institutions, high and low, are matters of discussion and question; when the State has lost its great treasure of firmness and permanence, and no man can tell whether a State of to-morrow may be the same as a State of to-day;—to endow this State with a Conscience is to vivify an abstraction with an unnatural life, and to confound the great problem of the just relations of spiritual and temporal authorities, which our age is in travail to resolve.

"The Catholic, or, as it is now accidentally denominated, the Puseyite doctrine of the Constitution and history of the Church of England, differs essentially from those already stated. It assumes that the Catholic Church is a special institution established by Christ and his Apostles, and transmitted by certain ordinances from one generation of mankind to another; that this institution is irrespective of all times and places, and can only contingently be connected with any political State, or identified with any national interest; that to this institution is divinely committed the preservation of religious truth, and the care and regulation of the spiritual concerns of all men baptized into the Church of Christ; and any interference with this jurisdiction on the part of the secular power is an usurpation, which must be protested against as unjust, and resisted by such means as are not out of character with the spiritual nature of the authority. The Church of England thus regarded, does not date its origin from the lusts of Henry the Eighth, and the scepticism of his minister Cromwell, but becomes that portion of the Church of Christ which was established in England, whether under the authority of the Roman patriarchate or with some earlier independent constitution. The Reformation here takes a due place as an event in history. Before that period, the encroachments it had to resist were not from the Roman See, but from the secular power at home, and the struggle for spiritual independence (a cause which was to those times what political independence is to ours, or, still more, the strife of mind against matter), which paused as it were for awe, at the martyrdom of Becket, continued till the public attention was drawn away to, and at last absolutely fixed on, the usurpations of the Court of Rome. The earnestness which still remained in Christendom revolted against the hollowness and untruth that filled the professed throne of St. Peter, and many were gradually alienated from a power which extended its assumptions almost in proportion as it became less worthy of the love

and honour of pious men. Moreover, the principle that the episcopal authority was but a mere emanation from the Papal, had never been fully admitted, and was now more repugnant than ever to those who saw that on a free action of the episcopal energies rested the hopes of a religious revival in the Church; and it is very significant that in the later sittings of the Council of Trent, the Spanish delegates insisted that episcopacy rested immediately on divine appointments, and that Paul IV. strongly censured the jealousy with which all sources of power and profit had been concentrated in Rome. These just motives, united to the desire of Princes to throw off the single check which the constitution of societies laid on their unbridled wills, and to the rapacity of Nobilities, who already scented the wealth of the Church, and to the hope of the deluded People that the property would be so applied that armies would be kept up without cost, and taxation be no more, brought on the separation from Rome, and that pillage from which the fear of the protecting power of the Holy See had so long kept off the hands of the unscrupulous and strong. When that separation was effected, it became the duty of the heads of the English Church to organize its new independence, and, at the same time, to exercise the discriminating authority which devolved upon them, after that of Rome was disallowed, as to questions of doctrine which vexed and divided the Christian World. The difficulty was to determine, not what seemed to them right or wrong, politic or impolitic in the matter, but what was the true Catholic doctrine, as distinct, on the one side, from those adaptations of it, and deductions from it, which the Pontificate had partly sanctioned, and partly overlooked, and on the other, from all those vagaries and caprices of interpretation of the Christian records which followed the license of private judgment in continental Protestantism. No man's opinion is worth having, on this subject, who does not admit the extent of this difficulty, and admire the skill and prudence with which it was in part overcome. The English divines fixed their eyes firmly on the early fathers of the Church, they probed the oldest liturgies and formularies, they bent their hearts to discover what was in very truth Catholic, what was '*semper et ubique et ab omnibus*.' If the Church of Rome, with all the apparatus of collateral learning, had drawn from the Canon of Scripture some erroneous conclusions, and had not been prevented by possession of it from actively or passively sanctioning abuses repugnant to all holy feelings and moral perceptions, how was it to be expected that the comparatively ignorant people, excited to the untutored study of those writings by Luther, 'the Bible-opener,' would not be liable in their turn to fall into confusion and error, unless provided with some authorized canon of interpretation? There was warning enough in the distracted course of the Reformation on the Continent, in the indecent objurgations among its leaders, in the gross misapplication of the study of the Old Testament, then gradually subduing the Christian spirit to that Judaic element, more congenial to violent tempers and vulgar minds, which culminated so fatally in Puritanism. Calvin was making a religion of the philosophy of despair; Zuinglius had set the Christian mind on a course precipitately tending to the prosaic

paganism of Socinus; the Roman Catholic world was looking on with a sneer or a smile, satisfied that the Reformation would soon fall to sleep on the ruins it had made; while through all this storm of passions and opinions, the reformers in England led on the Church, and brought her out at last safe in her Catholic doctrines, her special ordinances, her ancient formularies, and her legitimate claims."—p. 20.

Mr. Milnes attributes the rise of Puseyism to the Evangelical reaction which, from the days of Wesley, undertook to supply the religious and spiritual element to a Church that had sunk, from its long conflict with the spirit of Puritanism, into a mere political institution. The Evangelical party were really Dissenters rather than Catholic Churchmen, and the Church itself, shamed into rivalry, took up their own weapons in their own spirit, and whilst emulating their zeal and their piety forgot, or forbore, to urge the official claims and peculiar privileges of the Church. The abandoned ground of authority and privilege the Puseyites reclaimed, combining in one profession the earnestness of personal religion with the ancient authority, the ministerial power, and sacramental efficacy of the Catholic Church. Some of the incidental causes of this movement suggested by Mr. Milnes excite a smile when contemplated as coming from one who evidently has the power to look so much more deeply into the heart of outward changes. He attributes something to the general use at Oxford, between the years 1820 and 1830, of Whately's works on Logic and Rhetoric. The Archbishop, to whom is ascribed the felicitous designation of the *Newman-ia* for the Oxford Theology, would not be flattered by this curious connection of cause and effect.

Mr. Milnes defends the Oxford Theology against the two charges which have mainly been objected to it,—"the one of intolerance and illiberality incongruous with the public opinion of these days, and unworthy of our state of civilization: the other of popery, or at least of a tendency to revive the tyranny of Roman authority and the errors of Roman superstition."

Mr. Milnes alleges in reply that Intolerance is rather a temper than the necessary consequence of any doctrinal system,—but this is a very evasive answer, when the real question is, whether the Catholic System, as it is called, has not a direct tendency to excite and inflame this temper, and even to sanction and justify it. If indeed there is no Christian Salvation outside the Catholic Church,—if only the legitimate Clergy can administer the saving Rites, it is very idle, and something like mockery, to say in the face of a system so absolutely exclusive, that after all Intolerance is rather a Temper than the conse-

quence of a Doctrine. What other consistent consequence can such a Doctrine have but Intolerance? Would not Tolerance be a flat denial of the Doctrine? But Mr. Milnes gives us the comfort of the suggestion, that though there can be no *Christian* Salvation outside the Catholic Church, yet there may be other means of Salvation, not Christian, which neither he nor the Church know anything about. Indeed in the following noble passage Mr. Milnes would seem to admit that Intolerance is the tendency of the Doctrinal System, and to find a protection in the general influences of Civilization,—nor does he so much disown and rebuke the spirit of intolerance nourished by positive principles of belief, as the revolting manifestations of it in overt acts of the anti-social temper.

"Toleration as distinguished from selfish indifference and cold infidelity is the noblest produce of reason and civilization: it arises not from a disregard of truth possessed, but from an enlarged consciousness of truth every where struggling with error; not from a carelessness of the souls of other men, but from an increased sympathy with man as man, with his weakness and his strength, with his temptations and resistances, with his lights and his darkness: it grows with the advancement of our knowledge of ourselves and others, with the improvement of our insight into different motives of action, different systems of thought, different grounds of judgment, different processes of imagination; it spreads with our distrust of the good in ourselves, and of the evil in others: it is the child of Hope, and Hope is the good Genius of our time."—p. 43.

We confess we do not understand how the same man could write this passage, and in the next page declare his belief, that the covenant of Christianity must be a special one, and that it embraces only the members of the visible and historical (in other words the Episcopal) Church, and that however infinite are the mercies of God besides those vouched by Christianity, he cannot take it upon himself to declare the *salvation* of any out of the pale of that Church.

The allegation that the Oxford School of Theology leads to Popery, Mr. Milnes meets by what is vulgarly called "taking the bull by the horns." He says it is superfluous to become a member of the Church of Rome, because a man may find in the Church of England whatever Roman Catholicism can supply.

"An Englishman becoming a Roman Catholic, either knows nothing about or despairs of the Church of England.—A man joins the Roman Catholic Church because he does not know that he may be a good Catholic in the Church of England: Catholic principles, Catholic practices, Catholic uses of the

imagination and affections, are matters of spiritual necessity for his well-being: show him only that he can hold those principles and enjoy those practices, and exercise his imagination and affection in religious matters, in the Church of England, and it is very unlikely that he will adopt the resolution (which at any time must be most painful to his feelings as a citizen) of formally abjuring the national religion, and attaching himself to a communion which must always wear for him a foreign aspect, and uncongenial colouring." That is to say, identify for all practical purposes the Church of England with the Church of Rome, and it will be needless to turn Romanist.

Mr. Milnes contemplates the possibility of an union between the English and Roman Catholic Churches, and evidently believes that there is a spirit of life and truth in Romanism "which mere Protestantism can never expect to destroy." Protestantism, in his eyes, is but a negation, and it is only by partaking of the Catholic element that it becomes a religion. The main circumstances that raised the outcry against Popery at the era of the Reformation, Mr. Milnes very truly alleges may still be found in the very bosom of the English Church. These can form no insuperable barrier to an union with any who are not led by mere names, and who can recognise identity of spirit under variety of forms. Indeed, Whately's book, on the errors of Roman Catholicism traced to their origin in human nature, is an elaborate proof that the human nature of Catholicism is the human nature of Church of Englandism, and it is wonderful how so clear-sighted a man could fail to perceive that his analysis was precisely as applicable to the Church of England as to the Church of Rome. But controversialists never see the whole truth. The Catholic Churchman who has *sympathies* with Romanism perceives and acknowledges at once that there are evils common to the two Churches, as they have essential truths in common also. These common evils should be no obstacle to union, whilst the common truths have a natural tendency to coalesce. Puseyism has made many doctrinal concessions to a rational Christianity,—and here we have some practical concessions of no less moment. Without *Authority* it has already admitted we cannot be saved from doctrinal errors in the free interpretation of the scriptures: and even *with* authority, it now admits that neither the Church of England nor the Church of Rome has been saved from deadness and formalism and mere outward show in religion.

"It is now understood that the evils which the Reformation had at heart to remedy lie far deeper in human nature than was contemplated by the spiritual physicians of the time: the English Church detects in itself, and labours to correct many of the very errors which the reformers

protested against in the Roman. The practice of habitual confession is discontinued; but the worst part of it, the morbid habit of mind superinduced by continual introspection, the restless comparison of one's own spiritual state with that of others, the dwelling upon and realizing, as it were, bad thoughts and evil imaginations, those demoniac shadows which may flit across the brightest spirit, and the consequent absence of the cheerful and trustful faith which should distinguish a child of the Church,—all this is still amongst us, to be reproved and relieved. Pictures and statues are no longer objects of religious reverence, but words, which also are images of thought and sensible representations of ideas, are our common and unsuspected idols;—the dead letter of the scripture receives the same unintelligent regard that was paid to the dead wood and stone; prayers are uttered without a corresponding internal consciousness, just as crucifixes or scapulæ were unmeaningly worn: and the Liturgy of the Church of England is listened to by the majority of every congregation with as little appreciation of its connection of parts, of the mutual bearing of its selections, of the separation or interfusion of Christian doctrine and Judaic history, with as little knowledge of and insight into the real thought expressed, and as little intellectual sympathy, as ever was the Latin mass by the Romanist people. The sacerdotal influence no longer authoritatively interferes with the sacred relations of private life: but the favourite minister is frequently as careless of the high and separate functions of his office, as ready to be the flatterer, or class leader, or spoiled child, or anything but the pastor of the individuals composing his congregation, as ever could be the intriguing Confessor, or sensual Priest. These weaknesses of our own should facilitate the right understanding of the difficulties of others; contemplation of them should lead to that spirit of humility and forbearance by which alone we can hope to give effect to any attempt at reforming other churches: it is not by filching a member from them here and there, it is not by disturbing the faith in one view of the Church, where we cannot be sure of substituting another that we believe to be better, it is not by appeals to past abuses, which it only requires a certain amount of information and cleverness to recriminate on ourselves, that we can in any way better the condition of the church of Rome, and its members: the hopes of this work rest on the true application of Catholic principles, admitting purely all that is historically true and theologically fair, refusing earnestly all that is partial, local, and accidental, when it claims to be universal, and showing that we value aright their great, though we think unsuccessful, care, in preserving purity of doctrine, inasmuch as we, for the sake of that purity, have sacrificed the advantages and comforts of the visible Catholic unity."—p. 65.

All this may be a sufficient reason why Churches essentially one should not extrinsically be two,—but surely it is rather a reason for coming out from them both into the glorious liberty of the sons of God, and taking the free Gospel to the free soul, unrestricted in its sympathies by the material bounding lines of ecclesiastical formularies.

Mr. Milnes mentions two practical advantages that may accrue from the prevalence of Puseyism,—and though Puseyism has no real sympathy with these advantages, and they flow from the spirit of reserve and disdain with which she retreats from all contested matters into the inner sanctuary of the Church,—yet as they tend to outward liberty and quiet, we willingly admit the facts:

"The Catholic direction given by Puseyism to historical study will produce effects of much the same nature and extent: the original language of the Holy Writings will be more largely and critically understood,—Germany will no more be permitted to reign absolute over ecclesiastical or over other literature, and there will be a true, as there is a false, neology,—the great treasures of Continental Biblical criticism will be no longer held contraband in a system of divinity which, accepting the scriptures as the gift of the Church, is averse to no inquiry into their true interpretation and natural meaning, and does not permit the truth or falsehood of a doctrine to depend on the veracity or tenor of any single one or more particular paragraphs."

Again:

"One of the first demonstrations of Puseyism will be the removal of religious interference from matters of a purely secular nature, such as elementary education, and the distribution of charity. No churchman of these days will ever pretend to exclude others, not churchmen, from the advantage of reading and writing, or to make any selection of them in his charitable donations; yet he will not assent to any other religious teaching, but that which he believes to be true, and thus that confused and indeterminate intrusion of religious matters into circumstances, where they only derange and embitter, will, as far as he is able, be discouraged and avoided."

Nothing can be more forcible, more legitimate, than the *argumentum ad hominem* by which Mr. Milnes, in conclusion, forces his Catholicism on the Evangelical and the High Churchman. Certainly if we were either the one or the other, we should be sorely pressed by this appeal: "They who hesitate to declare themselves partakers of these views, would do well to consider whether the Church of England can go on any longer without some system of theology that rests on a scientific basis, and maintains itself by at least probable arguments. Are our formularies to be consistently understood? Are we to be left to schools of doctrine, clearly heterogeneous and arbitrary, without rule of faith to guide, or method of interpretation to follow, content to adopt one dogma, and to reject its necessary consequent? Are we not required to give logical and clear-headed men reasons why they should rather be Churchmen than Dis-

senters? Are we to attempt to systematize and complete the Anglican theology as we have received it from the Fathers of our Church, or to give up the task altogether as hopeless, and, confining ourselves to pressing practical duties, leave all articles of doctrine and speculation to the hazards of public opinion and the general dispensation of Providence? The sea of discussion on which we are afloat is certainly wide, but is that a reason why we should throw ourselves overboard?"—p. 88.

There is no escape from this: we must either float in the ark of the Church, or throw ourselves overboard on the billows of free thought. We must either nestle in the bosom of Catholicism, submissive and passive children, or use the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, in the service and pursuit of rational Christianity. There is no middle ground between Authority and absolute liberty, the Religion and worship of the individual soul. That there is no third course, Puseyism is labouring to demonstrate. What will be the answer of the English mind? To what side will the Genius of the nation incline when this alternative is more and more clearly placed before it? Are churches aware what cause they are serving when they are making prominent this truth,—"you have but a choice between two,—Catholicism, or perfect freedom; an authoritative Church with official clergy alone qualified to administer the saving sacraments,—or the rational worship of God by the individual soul, aided, sanctified and exalted by earnest personal communion with the Spirit of Christ, with no authorised interpreter to come between?"

ART. V.—REPORT TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT, FROM THE POOR LAW COMMISSIONERS, ON THE TRAINING OF PAUPER CHILDREN; with Appendices. 1841. Clowes and Sons. pp. 421.

THE very interesting volume before us consists chiefly of a selection from the reports furnished by the assistant Poor Law Commissioners, in answer to a circular desiring information on the following points:

1. The state of the Pauper Schools before passing the Poor Law Amendment Act.
2. The improvements which have been introduced into the schools since the passing of the Act.
3. The further improvements which might be introduced into them, and the obstacles to such further improvements.

There is also placed very appropriately at the beginning of the volume, some "evidence of employers of labourers on the influence of training and education on the value of workmen," taken by Edwin Chadwick, Esq., Secretary to the Poor Law Commissioners.

It could not be that the common Father of all had connected the prosperity of one class of society with the depression of another. Our own blindness alone could have made us for a moment believe it, and we might on that ground alone have rested assured, that in cultivating and developing the moral, intellectual, and spiritual nature of man, in *every* class, we *must* be promoting the welfare of the individual, of the class, and of the community at large; satisfied that if experience seemed to give any opposing testimony, it was against the limitation and imperfection only of our efforts that its evidence must be received.

The following examination is particularly deserving of attention from the discrimination evinced of the respective effects of national character, of special training to some particular kind of labour, and of school learning. All the employers unite in bearing testimony to the value of a more extended system of education than has hitherto been generally considered desirable for the operative; in giving him more varied occupation for his leisure hours, more respectable and economical habits, greater power of adapting his exertions to the accidental circumstances of his condition, and more reasonable views of his relations to, and claims upon, his employers.

"*Albert G. Escher, Esq.*

"You are an engineer residing at Zurich?—Yes: I am one of the partners of the firm of Escher, Wyss, and Co., of Zurich.

"What opportunities have you had of observing the moral and intellectual condition of working men, the natives of different countries, differently educated?—We employ from six to eight hundred men in our machine-making establishment at Zurich: we also employ about two hundred men in our cotton mills there; about five hundred men in our cotton manufactories in the Tyrol and in Italy. I have occasionally had the control of from five to six hundred men engaged in engineering operations as builders, masons, &c., and men of the class called navigators in England.

"Are the working people whom you employ, or have employed, in Switzerland, natives of that country?—No: partly Swiss, partly Germans of all the different states,—Saxons, Wurtemburghers, and others; partly French, some few Danes, some Norwegians, some Polanders, some Bohemians, some Hungarians, some English and Scotch, and some Dutch.

"Have the numbers of the different classes of workmen and the constancy of their employment been such as to enable you to discern their national characteristics?—Yes; I think I have had very full opportunities of distinguishing their various characters, which I have had moreover opportunities of observing and studying in their own countries, in several of which I have conducted works.

"In what order do you class the workmen of various nations in respect to such natural intelligence as may be distinguished from any intelligence imparted by the labours of the schoolmaster?—I class the Italians first; next the French; and the northern nations very much on a par.

"Do you include the English as of the northern family?—Yes, I do.

"What are the more particular natural characteristics of the several classes of workmen?—The Italians' quickness of perception is shown in rapidly comprehending any new descriptions of labour put into their hands, of quickly comprehending the meaning of their employer, of adapting themselves to new circumstances, much beyond what any other classes have. The French workmen have the like natural characteristics, only in a somewhat lower degree. The English, Swiss, German, and Dutch workmen, we find, have all much slower natural comprehension.

"What, however, do you find to be the differences of acquirements imparted by specific training and education?—As workmen *only*, the preference is undoubtedly due to the English; because as we find them, they are all trained to special branches, on which they have had comparatively superior training, and have concentrated all their thoughts. As men of business or of general usefulness, and as men with whom an employer would best like to be surrounded, I should, however, decidedly prefer the Saxons and the Swiss, but more especially the Saxons, because they have had a very careful general education, which has extended their capacities beyond any special employment, and rendered them fit to take up, after a short preparation, any employment to which they may be called. They will be found by their employers more generally useful.

" But is the superior general usefulness of the Saxon, or workman of superior education, accompanied by any distinction of superiority as to moral habits ?—Decidedly so. The better educated workmen we find are distinguished by superior moral habits in every respect. In the first place, they are entirely sober ; they are discreet in their enjoyments, which are of a more rational and refined kind ; they are more refined themselves, and they have a taste for much better society, which they approach respectfully, and consequently find much readier admittance to it ; they cultivate music ; they read ; they enjoy the pleasures of scenery, and make parties for excursions into the country ; they are economical, and their economy extends beyond their own purse to the stock of their master ; they are consequently honest and trustworthy. The effects of the deficiency of education is most strongly marked in the Italians, who, with the advantage of superior natural capacity, are of the lowest class of workmen, though they comprehend clearly and quickly, as I have stated, any simple proposition made or explanation given to them, and are enabled quickly to execute any kind of work when they have seen it performed once; yet their minds, as I imagine from want of development by training or school education, seem to have no kind of logic, no power of systematic arrangement, no capacity for collecting any series of observations, and making sound inductions from the whole of them. This want of the capacity of mental arrangement is shown in their manual operations. An Italian will execute a simple operation with great dexterity ; but when a number of them are put together all is confusion ; they cannot arrange their respective parts in a complicated operation, and are comparatively inefficient except under a very powerful control. As an example of this I may mention that within a few years after the first introduction of cotton-spinning in Naples, in the year 1830, the spinners produced twenty-four hanks of cotton yarn from No. 16 to 20 per spindle, which is equal to the production of the best English hands ; and yet up to this time *not one* of the Neapolitan operatives is advanced far enough to take the *superintendence* of the operations *of a single room,* the superintendents being all northerns, who, though much less gifted by nature, have obtained a higher degree of order or arrangement imparted to their minds by a superior education."—p. 2. * * * * *

" We find that they (the Scotch) get on much better on the continent than the English, which I ascribe chiefly to their better education, which renders it easier for them to adapt themselves to circumstances, and especially in getting on better with their fellow-workmen and all the people with whom they come in contact. Knowing their own language grammatically, they have comparatively good facility in acquiring foreign languages. They have a great taste for reading, and always endeavour to advance themselves in respectable society, which makes them careful of their conduct and eager to acquire such knowledge as may render themselves acceptable to better classes.

" Do you find these Scotch workmen equal to the Northern Germans and Saxons ?—As workmen they may, on account of their special and technical education, be superior, but as men in their general social con-

dition they are not so refined, and have lower tastes; they are lower in school education, and have less general information than the Saxons or other Northern Germans."—p. 4.

"In the present state of manufactures, where so much is done by machinery and tools, and so little is done by mere brute labour (and that little is diminishing), mental superiority, system order and punctuality and good conduct—qualities all developed and promoted by education—are becoming of the highest consequence. There are now, I consider, few enlightened manufacturers who will dissent from the opinion, that the workshops peopled with the greatest number of educated and well-informed workmen will turn out the greatest quantity of the best work in the best manner."—p. 5.

"By education I may say that I throughout mean not merely instruction in the arts of reading, writing, and arithmetic, but better general mental development; the acquisition of better tastes and of mental amusements and enjoyments which are cheaper, whilst they are more refined."—p. 7.

"*William Fairbairn, Esq.*

"You are an engineer?—Yes.

"What number of workmen do you employ?—About 680 in Manchester, and between 400 and 500 persons in London.

"In respect to change of operations, do you experience any advantages traceable to the school education of the best workmen?—Yes, we certainly find that those who have had a good school education have had a better conception of the organization and system implied in change of operation. It appears to require mental training in early life to enable a man to arrange a sequence of operations in the best manner for clear and efficient practical efforts. Men with such capacity we rarely find, except amongst those who have had a school education."—p. 11.

"In all questions respecting wages we always find the best educated workmen the most reasonable in their demands, and the most peaceable in their behaviour, most readily assenting to proper changes, whether for or against themselves."—p. 12.

"In respect to the conduct of workmen after their hours of labour, is there any expedient course which, upon experience, you can recommend for their improvement?—The main thing, it appears to me, for their social improvement is to provide for the occupation of their leisure hours; the first of these is to make the home comfortable, and to minister to the household recreation and amusement: this is a point of view in which the education of the wives of labouring men is really of very great importance, that they may be rational companions for men. In this point of view also, I think it very important that whatever out-door amusements are provided, should not be provided for the men alone, but rather for the men and wives together, and their children.

"Do you at the Lyceum make any arrangements for carrying out this principle?—Yes; we make a particular point of it. For example, a few nights ago a tea-party was given, to which the wives and families of the members were admitted, and at which there were various amusements. There was an exhibition of the musical glasses; there was also

a piano for some instrumental and some vocal music; there were reading and recitations from favourite authors, and very great entertainment was given at a very cheap rate to 400 or 500 men, women, and children. The opening of public walks, which might be resorted to by the men and families in fine weather, and gardens, would, as appears to me, be very valuable additions to these means."—p. 15.

Another gentleman—

"Speaking of the recreations which he had provided for the work-people, he said, 'Thou may think it strange for one of my persuasion,' (he is one of the Society of Friends,) 'but it is true, I have paid for a big drum and some horns, to give them mirth after their hours of labour.'"—p. 18.

The chief point of present interest however is not so much to accumulate evidence on the value of education, for that is generally conceded.

But how is this important culture to be most extensively and efficiently given? How is our labouring class to be raised in the scale of moral and social existence, to the point which individual attainment has shown to be practicable? To raise the class ought to be our object, not to enable individuals to leave that class for another, higher in rank, but not possessing greater means of happiness. For in what does the happiness of man in every class consist? In regular employment, *labour* of some kind, with a sufficient stimulus to its diligent performance; in freedom from anxiety as to the necessaries of life; in independence of mind; in the self-respect arising from a consciousness of important duties well performed; in the respect and esteem of those around us; in domestic ties and duties; in intellectual and social pleasures; in the pleasures of beneficence; in the hopes and the present happiness of religious trust. What material of happiness has man in any class which is not comprised in one or other of these? And which of these is not now possessed by many among the labouring class? Which of them might not be placed within the reach of all? All that Providence does for any of us is to place the *materials* of happiness within our reach: every individual must work out his own salvation here and hereafter. But we have unfortunately a class below labourers; a class possessing few indeed of the materials of happiness, a class which the suffering sent as discipline to reform and elevate seems only further to degrade, in which "chastening" though grievous does not "yield the peaceable fruits of righteousness," a class which we cannot believe ought to be allowed to exist—Paupers. How is this class to be extinguished? How are those born such to be raised to the rank of independent labourers,—to be made Intellectual, Moral, and Spiritual Beings?

Immortal, they already are. In what direction are they to be set forward on their endless race? How are we, who consider ourselves Intellectual, Moral, and Spiritual, to impart a brother's portion of these greatest of blessings to those whom Providence has made so entirely depending on our faithful stewardship of their Father's bounties?

There are now in our workhouses about 65,000 children under the age of 16. How are these to be trained?

Our first feeling is, is it right that the children of drunken idle parents should be better educated than those of the self-supported labourer? But a moment's thought will satisfy us that though "their clothes, food, and lodging should not be better than that which the labourer can provide for his child, yet whenever the community encounter the responsibility of providing for the education of children who have no natural guardians, it is impossible to adopt as a standard for the training of such children the average amount of care and skill now bestowed on the moral and religious culture of the children of the labouring classes generally, or to decide that their secular instruction shall be confined within limits confessedly so meagre and inadequate."—p. 19.

That the State neglects one of its duties, to place a good education within reach of all, is no reason it should not fulfil another where no one else can supply the omission, and educate well those whose education it *must* regulate. Public feeling will not allow the schools for the labouring classes long to remain generally inferior to those for the pauper children. We want chiefly good models, schools which will show us what can be accomplished, and how to accomplish it. Besides, at the time when the children leave the workhouse one of two results must ensue:

"1. Either the child must at that period have acquired such habits of industry, such skill in some useful art, and such correct moral habits, as to render his services desirable; in which case he will go to service, and his dependence will cease.

"Or, 2ndly, by neglect, or by the adoption of a system of training not calculated to prepare them for the discharge of the practical duties of their station in life, the pauper children maintained in workhouses are not *qualified for service*, and then it becomes necessary to adopt the old expedient for the removal of the burthen created by the absence of a correct system of moral and industrial training, viz. *to apprentice the children* to a trade or calling by paying a premium to some artizan to instruct them in an art by which they may earn their subsistence."—p. 25.

The latter was the alternative adopted under the old Poor

Law. The children grew up in idleness and ignorance, and melancholy are the answers to the first inquiry proposed by the Commissioners, viz. "The state of the pauper schools under the old Poor Law." The neglect of the workhouse was followed in too many instances, by entire disregard as to the character of the master to whom the child was apprenticed, to his ability to teach him a trade, or to the probability of the trade affording him support when it was acquired.

The distress of the hand-loom weavers of Spitalfields has been long notorious. The parent's inducement to employ his child in assisting him, supplies more workmen than the trade can support. The weavers pressed by want have been accustomed to seek relief by taking children as apprentices, with whom they received a premium of from £10 to £20. Mr. Christy, relieving officer of Bethnal Green, in which parish Spitalfields is situated, offered proof that from half to two-thirds of the indentures were afterwards cancelled, from the inability of the masters to support the children. Yet out of 199 children applying for apprenticeship from other parishes in 1835-6-7, he had successfully opposed only 39. Ill treatment often relieved the master from all expense, by causing the child to abscond. The effect of the consequent destitution and bad company, both to boys and girls, was what might be anticipated. But we will turn from these painful features of the past, to the second part of the inquiry, viz., "the improvements which have been introduced into the pauper schools since the passing of the Poor Law Amendment Act."

We had made copious extracts from the report of the largest of the improved schools, Mr. St. Aubin's establishment at Norwood, containing about 1,100 children, "the refuse of the City of London," but they occupy too much room; we must content ourselves with such brief abstract as we hope will induce our readers to turn to the report itself, which is only one of many full of interest and of hope.

The children spend six hours on alternate days, in the workshop, and in the school; classes of 50 tailors, 40 shoemakers, 3 or four blacksmiths, of 8 tinmen, 2 or 3 ostlers, 4 or 5 carpenters, and of about 30 mariners, are constantly receiving instruction. Those under eight years of age learn straw plaiting, and basket making. The girls are employed in household duties, in washing, ironing, mangling, sewing, knitting, &c.

In the school the instruction has a direct bearing on their future duties and wants. Geography teaches them the seats of manufactures and commerce. They keep accounts, write inventories, sum up the expenses of a household, and note the best

application of a labourer's wages under different circumstances: "the attention of the older classes is steadily directed to the dangers, advantages, duties, and responsibilities of the station they are about to occupy; they are carefully warned as to the causes of failure, and instructed by what measures of prudence they might generally be prevented."

"It is not intended by this training that the children shall be prepared for some particular handicraft or service, nor expected that such instruction is in any case to supersede the necessity for further training when accidentally the employment of the school may have prepared the child for his employment in after-life. It is desired only that the education of this class of labourers should have a direct relation to their condition in life, and expected that they may be taught the use of various tools, by which they may be enabled to increase the comfort of their households in after-life, without an expenditure of their earnings, or obtain better wages by superior usefulness. That a sailor should have learned at school to make his shoes and mend his clothes, or a labourer know how to cultivate his garden, may be taken as illustrations of the future application of such knowledge, but the instruction of the girls in household work, in frugal cookery, and in domestic management, appears not only essential as a part of moral training, but necessary as filling a lamentable void in the education of young females among the poorer classes.

"The moral training pervades every hour of the day, from the period when the children are marched from their bedrooms to the washhouse in the morning, to that when they march back to their bedrooms at night. By the constant presence of some teacher as a companion during the hours of recreation, they are taught to amuse themselves without mutual encroachment; they are trained in the practice of mutual forbearance and kindness; they are taught to respect property not their own, to avoid faults of language and manner, to treat their superiors with respectful confidence; they learn to show the affection they bear their teachers without fear of rebuke, to approach strangers with a simplicity of manner to which servility and audacity are alike foreign; they are trained in the practice of their religious duties, in a reverential observance of the Sunday, and in deference to the instructions of their authorized religious teachers. Propriety of demeanour in their bedrooms and at meals is a matter of special anxiety."—p. 113.

The following extracts from the letter of instruction to the chaplain at Norwood, shows the judicious care taken for their religious training:—

"The Commissioners invite your attention to the plans of instruction, and moral and industrial training, pursued under their direction, at the hours not devoted to religious instruction. They are anxious that, by such visits to these departments as your leisure may allow, you should have an opportunity of ascertaining to what subjects the attention of the

children is directed during the hours of regular instruction; what are their attainments generally; what means are adopted to rear them in correct moral habits; and what success attends these agencies; in order that you may thus be enabled to acquire such a knowledge of the diurnal domestic occurrences of the school, as may afford you the means of bringing your pastoral labours into constant practical relation with the moral wants and susceptibilities of the children.

"In one respect, the Commissioners feel that in establishments in which children are separated from society into an almost conventual seclusion, some risk of failure must be encountered from a want of the habit of self-direction amidst temptations to folly or crime, which habit can only be fully acquired by mixing with society in which the child must ultimately be exposed to such temptations, unless precautionary measures are diligently pursued.

"Domestic education frequently fails, because this habit has never been formed; and it is to be feared that, as society is constituted, no admonitions, how careful and skilful soever they may be, can compensate for the want of means to train a child in the avoidance and resistance of temptations to error.

"To the formation of this habit of self-direction, you will find that a large portion of the attention of the teachers is given.

"Periods of sickness will, of course, afford you opportunities for impressing the minds of the children with a sense of their religious duties and responsibilities, of which the Commissioners are aware that you will be anxious to avail yourself; and they trust the arrangements of the sick-wards will be such as will afford you the best facilities in this respect."—p. 125.

Those only who have visited Norwood can form an idea of the air of cheerful industry which pervades the establishment. The tailors and shoemakers, the neat little cooks and laundresses, all singing in parts, over their work, for they learn to sing from note and in parts, seems rather like the day-dream of some benevolent enthusiast, than a contractor's establishment of children, "descended in many instances from generations of paupers, born in the worst purlieus of a great city, who have wandered about the country in beggary, or been taught the art of petty thieving in towns, who have suffered privations of every kind, and have known neither comfort nor virtue."

We now come to the third subject of inquiry, "the further improvements which may be introduced into the pauper schools, and the obstacles to such further improvements."

The greatest obstacle to improvement in the way of all practical friends of education, is the want of suitable teachers, especially for industrial schools:—

"A good schoolmaster ought to be a man who knows much more than he is called upon to teach, that he may teach with intelligence and

with taste; who is to live in a humble sphere, and yet to have a noble and elevated mind, that he may preserve that dignity of sentiment and of deportment, without which he will never obtain the respect and confidence of families; who possesses a rare mixture of gentleness and firmness; for, inferior though he be in station to many individuals in the parish, he ought to be the obsequious servant of none; a man not ignorant of his rights, but thinking much more of his duties; showing to all a good example, and serving to all as a counsellor; not given to change his condition, but satisfied with his situation, because it gives him the power of doing good; and who has made up his mind to live and to die in the service of primary instruction, which to him is the service of God and his fellow-creatures. To rear masters approaching to such a model is a difficult task; and yet we must succeed in it, or else we have done nothing for elementary instruction."—p. 326.

Such is M. Guizot's description of what a teacher ought to be. Where are we to find such? or rather, how are we to form such, to educate, not only the 65,000 pauper children in our workhouses, but the children of our labourers, who also have a claim to an education very superior to any now provided for them.

Happily such schools and such teachers do exist. "The children to whom Pestalozzi devoted his life were of a similar class, equally ignorant, perhaps equally demoralized, in consequence of the internal discords attendant on the revolutionary wars which at the time his labours commenced had left Switzerland in ruin."

"The class of children which De Fellenberg placed under the charge of Vehrli at Hofwyl were in like manner picked up on the roads of the canton—they were the outcasts of Berne.

"These circumstances are among the motives which led us to a careful examination of the schools of industry and normal schools of the cantons of Switzerland. These schools are more or less under the influence of the lessons which Pestalozzi and De Fellenberg have taught that country. They differ in some important particulars from those which exist in England, and the experience of Switzerland in this peculiar department of elementary instruction appears pre-eminently worthy of attention."—p. 204.

Dr. Kay and Mr. Tufnell have therefore devoted a considerable time to visiting the different normal and industrial schools of Switzerland. They have also given considerable attention to those of France, Holland, Prussia, and Saxony. We will give some extracts from the account of one only of the schools they visited in Switzerland:—

"The normal school at Kruitzlingen is in the summer palace of the former abbot of the convent of that name, on the shore of the Lake of

Constance, about one mile from the gate of the city. The pupils are sent thither from the several communes of the canton, to be trained three years by Vehrli, before they take charge of the communal schools. Their expenses are borne in part by the commune, and partly by the council of the canton. We found ninety young men, apparently from eighteen to twenty-four or twenty-six years of age, in the school. Vehrli welcomed us with frankness and simplicity, which at once won our confidence. We joined him at his frugal meal. He pointed to the viands, which were coarse, and said, 'I am a peasant's son. I wish to be no other than I am, the teacher of the sons of the peasantry. You are welcome to my meal: it is coarse and homely, but it is offered cordially.'

"We sat down with him. 'These potatoes,' he said, 'are our own. We won them from the earth, and therefore we need no dainties, for our appetite is gained by labour, and the fruit of our toil is always savoury.' This introduced the subject of industry. He told us all the pupils of the normal school laboured daily some hours in a garden of several acres attached to the house, and that they performed all the domestic duty of the household. When we walked out with Vehrli, we found them in the garden digging, and carrying on other garden operations, with great assiduity. Others were sawing wood into logs, and chopping it into billets in the court-yard. Some brought in sacks of potatoes on their backs, or baskets of recently gathered vegetables. Others laboured in the domestic duties of the household.

"After a while the bell rang, and immediately their out-door labours terminated, and they returned in an orderly manner, with all their implements, to the court-yard, where, having deposited them, thrown off their frocks, and washed, they reassembled in their respective class-rooms.

"We soon followed them. Here we listened to lessons in mathematics, proving that they were well grounded in the elementary parts of that science. We saw them drawing from models with considerable skill and precision, and heard them instructed in the laws of perspective. We listened to a lecture on the code of the canton, and to instruction in the geography of Europe. We were informed that their instruction extended to the language of the canton, its construction and grammar, and especially to the history of Switzerland; arithmetic; mensuration; such a knowledge of natural philosophy and mechanics as might enable them to explain the chief phenomena of nature and the mechanical forces; some acquaintance with astronomy. They had continual lessons in pedagogy, or the theory of the art of teaching, which they practised in the neighbouring village school. We were assured that their instruction in the Holy Scriptures, and other religious knowledge, was a constant subject of solicitude.

"The following extract from Vehrli's address at the first examination of the pupils, in 1837, will best explain the spirit that governs the seminary, and the attention paid there to what we believe has been too often neglected in this country—the education of the heart and feelings, as distinct from the cultivation of the intellect. It may appear strange

to English habits to assign so prominent a place in an educational institution to the following points, but the indication here given of the superior care bestowed in the formation of the character, to what is given to the acquisition of knowledge, forms in our view the chief charm and merit in this and several other Swiss seminaries, and is what we have laboured to impress on the institution we have founded. To those who can enter into its spirit, the following extract will not appear tinctured with too sanguine views :—

" ' The course of life in this seminary is threefold.

" ' 1st.—Life in the home circle, or family life.

" ' 2nd.—Life in the school-room.

" ' 3rd.—Life beyond the walls in the cultivation of the soil.

" ' I place the family life first, for here the truest education is imparted ; here the future teacher can best receive that cultivation of the character and feelings which will fit him to direct those, who are entrusted to his care, in the ways of piety and truth.

" ' A well-arranged family circle is the place where each member, by participating in the other's joys and sorrows, pleasures and misfortunes, by teaching, advice, consolation, and example, is inspired with sentiments of single-mindedness, of charity, of mutual confidence, of noble thoughts, of high feelings, and of virtue.

" ' In such a circle can a true religious sense take the firmest and the deepest root. Here it is that the principles of Christian feeling can best be laid, where opportunity is continually given for the exercise of affection and charity, which are the first virtues that should distinguish a teacher's mind. Here it is that kindness and earnestness can most surely form the young members to be good and intelligent men, and that each is most willing to learn and receive an impress from his fellow. He who is brought up in such a circle, who thus recognises all his fellow-men as brothers, serves them with willingness whenever he can, treats all his race as one family, loves them, and God their father above all, how richly does such a one scatter blessings around ! What earnestness does he show in all his doings and conduct, what devotion especially does he display in the business of a teacher ! How differently from him does that master enter and leave his school, whose feelings are dead to a sense of piety, and whose heart never beats in unison with the joys of family life.

" ' Where is such a teacher as I have described most pleasantly occupied ? In his school amongst his children, with them in the house of God or in the family circle, and wherever he can be giving or receiving instruction. A great man has expressed, perhaps too strongly, " I never wish to see a teacher who cannot sing." With more reason I would maintain, that a teacher to whom a sense of the pleasures of a well-arranged family is wanting, and who fails to recognise in it a well-grounded religious influence, should never enter a school-room.'

" As we returned from the garden with the pupils on the evening of the first day, we stood for a few minutes with Vehrli in the court-yard by the shore of the lake. The pupils had ascended into the class-rooms,

and the evening being tranquil and warm, the windows were thrown up, and we shortly afterwards heard them sing in excellent harmony. As soon as this song had ceased we sent a message to request another, with which we had become familiar in our visits to the Swiss schools; and thus, in succession, we called for song after song of Nageli, imagining that we were only directing them at their usual hour of instruction in vocal music. There was a great charm in this simple but excellent harmony. When we had listened nearly an hour, Vehrli invited us to ascend into the room where the pupils were assembled. We followed him, and on entering the apartment great was our surprise to discover the whole school, during the period we had listened, had been cheering with songs their evening employment of peeling potatoes, and cutting the stalks from the green vegetables and beans which they had gathered in the garden. As we stood there they renewed their choruses till prayers were announced. Supper had been previously taken. After prayers, Vehrli, walking about the apartment, conversed with them familiarly on the occurrences of the day, mingling with his conversation such friendly admonition as sprang from the incidents, and then lifting his hands he recommended them to the protection of heaven, and dismissed them to rest.

"We spent two days with great interest in this establishment. Vehrli had ever on his lips, 'We are peasants' sons. We would not be ignorant of our duties, but God forbid that knowledge should make us despise the simplicity of our lives.'

"We were greatly charmed in this school by the union of comparatively high intellectual attainments among the scholars, with the utmost simplicity of life, and cheerfulness in the humblest menial labour. Their food was of the coarsest character, consisting chiefly of vegetables, soups, and very brown bread. They rose between four and five, took three meals in the day, the last about six, and retired to rest at nine. They seemed happy in their lot. Such men, we felt assured, would go forth cheerfully to their humble village homes to spread the doctrine which Vehrli taught of peace and contentment in virtuous exertion; and men similarly trained appeared to us best fitted for the labour of reclaiming the pauper youth of England to the virtues, and restoring them to the happiness of her best-instructed peasantry."—p. 208.

There are some particulars of the Dutch schools well worth attention, but we must pass them over, as we are anxious to give some extracts from the account of the result of these observations, the training school established by these gentlemen on their return. We cannot however, deny ourselves the pleasure of extracting a short notice of the labours of some of our Catholic fellow Christians, as we, in common with many others, have believed that form of Christianity less favourable than others to this peculiar field of charity:—

"The philanthropy of the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine, who devote their lives a cheerful sacrifice to the education of the poorer

classes of France, can be understood best by those who have visited their noviciate and schools at Paris. From such persons we expect acquiescence when we say, that their example of Christian zeal is worthy of the imitation of Protestants. Three of the brothers of this order are maintained for a sum which is barely the stipend of one teacher of a school of mutual instruction in Paris. Their schools are unquestionably the best at Paris. Their manners are simple, affectionate, and sincere. The children are singularly attached to them. How could it be otherwise, when they perceivethat these good men have no other reward on earth for their manifold labours than that of an approving conscience?

"The *regime* of the *Noviciate* is one of considerable austerity. They rise at four. They spend an hour in private devotion, which is followed by two hours of religious exercises in their chapel. They breakfast soon afterwards, and are in the day schools of Paris at nine. They dine about noon, and continue their attention to the schools till five. They sup at six, and then many of them are employed in evening schools for the adults from seven to nine, or from eight to ten, when, after prayers, they immediately retire to rest.

"No one can enter the schools of the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine without feeling instinctively that he is witnessing a remarkable example of the development of Christian charity.

"With such motives should the teachers of elementary schools, and especially those who are called to the arduous duties of training pauper children, go forth to their work. The path of the teacher is strewn with disappointments, if he commence with a mercenary spirit. It is full of encouragement, if he be inspired with the spirit of Christian charity. No skill can compensate adequately for the absence of a pervading religious influence on the character and conduct of the schoolmaster."

As there seemed no immediate prospect of Government establishing any school giving the desirable training, Dr. Kay and Mr. Tufnell say, we "thought that as a last resort we should not incur the charge of presumption, if, in private and unaided, we endeavoured to work out the first steps of the establishment of an institution for the training of teachers, which we hoped might afterwards be entrusted to abler hands. We determined therefore to devote a certain portion of our own means to this object, believing that when the scheme of the institution was sufficiently mature to enable us to speak of results rather than of anticipations, the well-being of 50,000 pauper children would plead its own cause with the Government and the public, so as to secure the future prosperity of the establishment. We were led to select premises at Battersea, chiefly on account of the very frank and cordial welcome with which the suggestion of our plans was received by the Hon. and Rev. Robert Eden, the vicar of Battersea. Mr. Eden offered the use of his village schools in aid

of the training school, as the sphere in which the pupils might obtain a practical acquaintance with the art of instruction. He also undertook to superintend the training school in all that related to religion."

They intend having boys bound from fourteen to twenty-one, that they shall receive instruction in Battersea training school at least three years; then be employed at least three hours a-day in the village school for two years, and the remainder of their time act as assistant-teachers under good masters in some of the pauper schools of industry. They have twenty-four of these pupils now in the school, selected chiefly from orphans in the Norwood establishment. They have, besides these, nine young men training for the schools of personal friends.

"The subjects of instruction were divided, in the first instance, into two departments, which will be described in this Report; and over each of these departments a tutor was placed. Mr. Horne arrived at the opening of the school, and Mr. Tate on the 22nd of March 1840.

"The domestic arrangements were conducted with great simplicity, because it was desirable that the pupils should be prepared for a life of self-denial. A sphere of great usefulness might require the labours of a man ready to live among the peasantry on their own level—to mingle with them in their habitations—to partake their frugal or even coarse meals—and to seem their equal only, though their instructor and guide. It was desirable, therefore, that the diet should be as frugal as was consistent with constant activity of mind, and some hours of steady and vigorous labour, and that it should not pamper the appetite by its quality or its variety.

"A schoolmaster might settle in a situation in which a school-house only was provided. Prudence might dictate that he should not marry, and then his domestic comfort would depend on himself.

"No servants, therefore, were provided, with the exception of a matron, who acted as cook. The whole household-work was committed to the charge of the boys and young men; and for this purpose the duties of each were appointed every fortnight, in order that they might be equally shared by all. The young men above twenty years of age did not aid in the scouring of the floors and stairs, nor clean the shoes, grates, and yards, nor assist in the serving and waiting at meals, the preparation of vegetables and other garden-stuff for the cook. But the making of beds and all other domestic duty was a common lot; and the young men acted as superintendents of the other work.

"This was performed with cheerfulness, though it was some time before the requisite skill was attained; and perfect order and cleanliness have been found among the habits most difficult to secure. The pupils and students were carefully informed, that these arrangements were intended to prepare them for the discharge of serious duties in a humble sphere, and to nerve their minds for the trials and vicissitudes of life.

"The masters partook the same diet as the pupils, sitting in the centre of the room, and assisting in the carving. They encouraged familiar conversation (avoiding the extremes of levity or seriousness) at the meals, but on equal terms with their scholars, with the exception only of the respect involuntarily paid them.

"After a short time a cow was bought, and committed to the charge of one of the elder boys. Three pigs were afterwards added to the stock, then three goats, and subsequently poultry and a second cow. These animals were all fed and tended, and the cows were daily milked, by the pupil teachers. It seemed important that they should learn to tend animals with care and gentleness; that they should understand the habits and the mode of managing these particular animals, because the schoolmaster in a rural parish often has a common or forest-right of pasture for his cow, and a forest-run for his pig or goat, and might thus, with a little skill, be provided with the means of healthful occupation in his hours of leisure, and of providing for the comfort of his family.

"Moreover, such employments were deemed important, as giving the pupils, by actual experience, some knowledge of a peasant's life, and therefore truer and closer sympathy with his lot. They would be able to render their teaching instructive, by adapting it to the actual condition and associations of those to whom it would be addressed. They would be in less danger of despising the labourer's daily toil in comparison with intellectual pursuits, and of being led by their own attainments to form a false estimate of their position in relation to the class to which they belonged, and which they were destined to instruct. The teacher of the peasant's child occupies, as it were, the father's place, in the performance of duties from which the father is separated by his daily toil, and unhappily at present by his want of knowledge and skill. But the schoolmaster ought to be prepared in thought and feeling to do the peasant-father's duty, by having sentiments in common with him, and among these an honest pride in the labour of his hands, in his strength, his manual skill, his robust health, and the manly vigour of his body and mind."—p. 214.

We recommend the following remarks to the careful consideration of all engaged in conducting schools for the labouring classes.

"The knowledge of the marching exercise is very useful in enabling a teacher to secure precision and order in the movements of the classes or of his entire school, and to pay a due regard to the carriage of each child. A slouching gait is at least a sign of vulgarity, if it be not a proof of careless habits—of an inattention to the decencies and proprieties of life, which in other matters occasion discomfort in the labourer's household. Habits of cleanliness, punctuality, and promptitude are not very compatible with indolence, nor with that careless lounging, which frequently squanders not only the labourer's time, but his means, and leads his awkward steps to the village tavern. In giving the child an erect and manly gait, a firm and regular step, precision and rapidity

in his movements, promptitude in obedience to commands, and particularly neatness in his apparel and person, we are insensibly laying the foundation of moral habits, most intimately connected with the personal comfort and the happiness of the future labourer's family. We are giving a practical moral lesson, perhaps more powerful than the precepts which are inculcated by words. Those who are accustomed to the management of large schools know of how much importance such lessons are to the establishment of that order and quiet which is the characteristic of the Dutch schools, and which is essential to great success in large schools. A notion is prevalent in some of our English schools that a considerable noise is unavoidable, and some teachers are understood to regard the noise as so favourable a sign of the activity of the school, as even to assert, that the greater the noise the greater the intellectual progress of the scholars. The intellectual activity of the best Dutch schools is quite as great as that of any school in this country, and their average merit is exceedingly greater than that of the town schools of England; but a visitor seldom finds in a school of 700 children more than twelve persons speaking in the room at the same time, and those twelve persons are each speaking in a natural tone, and are distinctly heard. Such results do not depend solely or chiefly on the discipline of the drill-master, but they arise, in fact, from the minute attention to all the details of the school organization which secures the greatest amount of attention from the pupil, with the least amount of disturbance to his fellows. In the result, however, attention to the *posture* and to the *movements* of the children is by no means an unimportant element."—p. 212.

That nothing might be wanting to the success of the undertaking that care could supply, Dr. Kay resides in the establishment. Occasionally he has "accompanied them in long walking excursions into the country, in which they spent the whole day in visiting some distant school or remarkable building connected with historical associations, or some scene replete with other forms of instruction. In those excursions their habits of observation were cultivated, their attention was directed to what was most remarkable, and to such facts and objects as might have escaped observation from their comparative obscurity. Their strength was taxed by the length of the excursion, as far as was deemed prudent; and after their return home they were requested to write an account of what they had seen, in order to afford evidence of the nature of the impressions which the excursion had produced."—p. 209.

We cannot resist extracting a part of their sketch of the school as a household.

"The period which has elapsed since the school was assembled is much too brief to enable us fully to realize our conception of such a

household among young persons, to the majority of whom the suitable example had perhaps never been presented.

"The most obvious truth lay at the threshold—a family can only subsist harmoniously by mutual love, confidence, and respect. We did not seek to put the tutors into situations of inaccessible authority, but to place them in the parental seat, to receive the willing respect and obedience of their pupils, and to act as the elder brothers of the young men. The residence of one of us for a certain period, in near connection with them, appeared necessary to give that tone to the familiar intercourse which would enable the tutors to conduct the instruction, and to maintain the discipline, so as to be at once the friends and guides of their charge.

"It was desirable that the tutors should reside in the house. They rose at the same hours with the scholars (except when prevented by sickness), and superintended more or less the general routine. Since the numbers have become greater, and the duties more laborious, it has been found necessary that the superintendence of the periods of labour should be committed to each tutor alternately. They have set the example in working, frequently giving assistance in the severest labour, or that which was least attractive.

"In the autumn, some extensive alterations of the premises were to a large extent effected by the assistance of the entire school. The tutors not only superintended but assisted in the work. Mr. Tate contributed his mechanical knowledge, and Mr. Horne assisted in the execution of the details. In the cheerful industry displayed on this and on other similar occasions we have witnessed with satisfaction one of the best fruits of the discipline of the school. The conceit of the pedagogue is not likely to arise among either students or masters who cheerfully handle the trowel, the saw, or carry mortar in a hod to the top of the building; such simplicity of life is not very consistent with that vanity which occasions insincerity. But freedom from this vice is essential to that harmonious interchange of kind offices and mutual respect which we were anxious to preserve.

"The diet of the household is simple. The fruits and vegetables of the garden afford the chief variety without luxury. The teachers sit in the midst of their scholars. The familiar intercourse of the meals is intended to be a means of cultivating kindly affections, and of insuring that the example of the master shall insensibly form the habits of the scholar. Every day confirms the growing importance of these arrangements.

"It has been an object of especial care that the morning and evening prayers should be conducted with solemnity.

"The reports of the superintendents are presented to Dr. Kay immemediately after morning prayers. The record is read in the presence of the school, and any appeal against the entry heard. At this period the relation which the entire discipline holds to the future pursuits of the pupils is from time to time made familiar to them by simple expositions of the principles by which it is regulated.

"The superintendents are chosen from among those students who

appear to possess the requisite qualifications. We thus possess an unexceptionable means of distinguishing with offices of trust those in whom we can place most confidence, and of preparing them for the discharge of their future duties by accustoming them to a mild vigilance, to fidelity, impartiality, and firmness. On the other hand, the rest of the pupils learn subordination to those who, on account of these qualifications, exercise a limited degree of control over them, and are thus prepared to occupy subordinate positions if it be found necessary that they should be employed as assistants."—p. 222.

For the particular subjects and courses of instruction in the last year, and those which were contemplated for the present one, we must refer to the report itself. There are very full accounts also of examinations testing the progress of the pupils in their various pursuits. To one line of instruction, however, we must be allowed to devote a few words. It is true "that among the labouring classes no habit is more essential to virtuous conduct than that of steady persevering labour." It is a not less important truth that "labour which brings the sweat upon the brows requires relaxation, and the child should therefore learn to repose from toil among innocent enjoyments, and to avoid those vicious indulgences which waste the labourer's strength, rob his house of comfort, and must sooner or later be the source of sorrow. There is a dignity in the lot of man in every sphere, if it be not cast away. The honour and the joy of successful toil should fill the labourer's songs in his hour of repose."

That dignity is closely connected with a man's employment of his leisure. How grievously, how entirely is it often cast away! The child should learn those tastes and pursuits which are not merely innocent but improving and elevating. We greatly rejoice in the music and drawing, and especially in the proposed "course of reading in English literature, by which the taste may be refined by an acquaintance with the best models of style, and with those authors whose works have exercised the most beneficial influence on the mind of this nation."

Though no account has been extracted of the provision for religious instruction, it has not been overlooked, either in the plans, or in the specimens given of the examinations. But they shall give their own views of their aims.

"The formation of character is always kept in mind as the great aim of education. The intelligence is enlightened, in order that it may inform the conscience, and that the conscience, looking forth through this intelligence, may behold a wider sphere of duty, and have at its command a greater capacity for action. The capacity for action is determined by the cultivation of habits appropriate to the duties of the station which the child must occupy.

"From religion man learns that all the artificial distinctions of society are as nothing before that God who searcheth the heart. Religion therefore raises the labourer to the highest dignity of human existence, the knowledge of the will and the enjoyment of the favour of God. Instructed by religion, the labourer knows how in daily toil he fulfils the duties and satisfies the moral and natural necessities of his existence, while the outward garb of mortality is gradually wearing off, and the spirit preparing for emancipation.

"An education guided by the principles described in this brief sketch, appears to us appropriate to the preparation of the outcast and orphan children for the great work of a Christian's life."

The expense of this admirable experiment has been borne by Dr. Kay and Mr. Tufnell, with the exception of the payments made for some of the students, and the unsolicited aid of three or four personal friends. The expenses of 1840 were £1,283. Those for 1841 they estimated as likely to amount to at least £2,000.

"We are prepared to sustain this expense, if it be necessary that the training school should be carried through another stage of its development before it deserves the public confidence. In fact, we consider ourselves bound to do so should we obtain no assistance, as we have entered into engagements with the pupils which we must fulfil at whatever cost to ourselves."

We bid them God-speed in their very spirited and admirable undertaking. The New Poor Law has been called hard and unfeeling,—we refer to many passages extracted, and ask when the old Poor Law, with its demoralizing indulgences for adults, its equally demoralizing privations and hardships for the young, called forth in any of its officers such a spirit of active love, of judicious enterprising philanthropy, as breathes through the volume before us.

But this is all for the young: education does not end with youth; and as we ourselves are no longer young, we have read with peculiar sympathy some incidental notices of means of improvement for adults. The pleasures of science, literature, and taste, are not only elevating but cheap pleasures. How many generations would the million saved last year* from spirits in Ireland supply with lyceums, libraries, public gardens, &c.? Mechanics' Institutes and cheap scientific publications have attested for some years the prevailing conviction of the desirable-

* The excise of spirits in Ireland was deficient last year £500,000. The sum saved to the consumers of whiskey must have been at least double that.

ness of cultivating scientific pursuits among the labouring classes. But was it quite reasonable to expect, that what formed the severer studies of the more cultivated, should be the relaxation of the less developed intellect? The discovery seems at last to be made, that we must not expect so much more from the ignorant than we do from the informed; that poetry, and even fiction, must be published cheap, if we expect books to supersede the dram-shop, and that social pleasures, drawing and singing classes, will draw many from the alehouse, to whom Mechanics' Institutes, and publications of Useful Knowledge offer no attractions. The importance of providing such recreations is stated by several employers in the evidence at the commencement of this volume, and the conviction has been acted on by several large manufacturers for some years. Play-grounds have been provided, furnished with quoits, swings, les graces, &c.; music classes have been encouraged; the operatives have saved their money and time from the alehouse to pay for musical instruments and music lessons; and we know more than one band who have paid for their instruments above £40. Tea-parties have been given in large school-rooms: sometimes to listen to music and reading aloud; at others they have been left free to amuse themselves. The women have brought their work, the young people amused themselves with dissected maps, spelikins, draughts, chess, riddles, magical lanterns, music, prints, &c.: while their employers or the directors of the evening mixed with them on the terms of host and guest; cheap concerts have been given at the Lyceums, where the music has been excellent, and the performance respectable. We understand that the music classes of Mr. Hullah at Exeter Hall are becoming numerous and crowded. We are not aware in what the peculiarity of his method consists. The commissioners seem to consider it an important improvement, and the committee of council are preparing tablets and instructions.

"We have assisted in the development of this method, being convinced that it may tend to elevate the character of our elementary schools, and that it may be of great use throughout the country in restoring many of our best old English melodies to their popularity, and in improving the character of our vocal music in village churches, through the medium of the parochial schoolmaster and his pupils.

"Those who desire further proof of the importance of the method of Wilhem should visit the normal school at Versailles, various day-schools at Paris, and especially the great assemblages of the working classes, which occur almost every evening in Paris, for the purpose of receiving instruction in vocal music. The most remarkable of these

probably is at the Halle-aux-Draps, where from three hundred to five hundred artisans are almost every evening instructed, from eight to nine o'clock, in vocal music. M. Hubert, a pupil of Wilhem, conducts this great assembly, by the method of mutual instruction, with singular skill and precision. We know scarcely any thing more impressive than the swell of these manly voices when they unite in chorus.

"If the music of Handel and Haydn were better known by the professors of music at Paris, assuredly this would be the place in which to display its most remarkable effects. Even in the singing of Wilhem's solfeggios in harmony, or of the scale in harmony, such a volume of sound was poured forth, that the effects were very impressive.

"A method which has succeeded in attracting thousands of artisans in Paris from low cabarets and miserable gambling-houses to the study of a science, and the practice of a captivating art, deserves the attention of the public. Mr. Hullah, in adapting the method of Wilhem to English tastes and habits, has both simplified and refined it. He has, moreover, adapted to it a considerable number of old English melodies, of great richness and character, which were fast passing into oblivion, and which may be restored to the place they once held in the affections of the people, being now allied with words expressive of the joys and hopes of a labourer's life, and of the true sources of its dignity and happiness."

We quite agree in the value placed on the acquirement of drawing. Some improvements in the art of teaching it, particularly those of M. Dupuis, we hope may be introduced here, and that ere long we may have evening schools, resembling those of the Brothers of Christian Doctrine at Paris, with an account of which we will close our extracts from this very cheering and interesting volume.

"Last Midsummer, in some of the evening schools of the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine, classes of workmen were questioned as to their employments. One was an *ebéniste*, another a founder, another a clockmaker, another a paperhanger, another an upholsterer; and each was asked his hours of labour, and his motives for attendance. A single example may serve as a type. A man, without his coat, whose muscular arms were bared by rolling his shirt sleeves up to his shoulders, and who, though well washed and clean, wore the marks of toil on his white horny hands, was sitting with an admirable copy in crayon of *La Donna della Segiola* before him, which he had nearly completed. He was a man about forty-five years of age. He said he had risen at five, and had been at work from six o'clock in the morning, until seven o'clock in the evening, with brief intervals for meals; and he had entered the morning class at eight o'clock to remain there till ten. He had pleasure, he said, in drawing, and that a knowledge of the art greatly improved his skill and taste in masonry. He turned round with a good-humoured smile, and added, he could live better on less wages than an

Englishman, because his drawing cost him less than beer. Some thousand working men attend the adult schools every evening in Paris, and the drawing classes comprise great numbers whose skill would occasion much astonishment in this country. The most difficult engravings of the paintings of the Italian masters are copied in crayon with remarkable skill and accuracy. Complex and exquisitely minute architectural details, such, for example, as perspective views of the Duomo at Milan, or the cathedrals at Rouen or Cologne, are drawn in pen and ink, with singular fidelity. Some were drawing from plaster casts and other models. We found such adult schools in many of the chief towns of France. These schools are the sources of the taste and skill in the decorative arts, and in all manufactures of which taste is a prominent element, and which have made the designs for the calico printers, the silk and ribbon looms, the papers, &c. &c., of France, so superior in taste to those of this country, notwithstanding the superiority of our manufactories in mechanical combinations.

"These considerations lead us to account drawing an important department of elementary education.

"The improvement of our machinery for agriculture and manufactures would be in no small degree facilitated, if the art of drawing were a common acquirement among our artisans. Invention is checked by the want of skill in communicating the conception of the inventor, by drawings, of all the details of his combination. The manufacturers of Lancashire are well aware how difficult it is, from the neglect of the arts of design among the labourers of this country, to procure any skilled draftsmen to design for the cotton or silk manufacturer. The elevation of the national taste in art can only be procured by the constant cultivation of the mind in relation to the beautiful in form and colour, by familiarizing the eye with the best models, the works of great artists, and beautiful natural objects. Skill in drawing from nature results from a careful progress through a well-analyzed series of models. The interests of commerce are so intimately connected with the results to be obtained by this branch of elementary education, that there is little chance that it will much longer suffer the grievous neglect it has hitherto experienced."

We cannot but believe, that a means of amusement which we have heard suggested, though we are not aware of its adoption any where, might prove a powerful rival to the alehouse, with the numbers whose scholarship is too imperfect, and whose intellect is too little developed to render its exercise a pleasure, except with every aid and stimulus. The cheap theatres, perhaps the only intellectual attraction to this class, are at present schools of vice. But would not a good reader, though not appealing by scenery to the eye, have a similar, though less powerful charm? From our best works of Fiction and Poetry, from History, Biography, and Travels, scenes of stirring interest,

examples of heroic and of gentle virtue, facts in science and in natural history, might be selected, which, while they aroused the attention and interest of the most stupid, would inform the intellect, raise the moral standard, and refine the taste of the most enlightened among the hearers; and those whose days were necessarily passed among the vulgar and the worldly, might spend their evenings in contemplating and sympathizing with examples of all that is great and generous.

---

## SONNET.

The evening breeze now rising from the west
With rippling sound sweeps through the aspen leaves,
Plays 'mid the gathered corn-fields' golden sheaves,
And gently rocks the sedge-bird in her nest;
Now as it lightly skims the blue waves' breast
A song of mournful melody it weaves,
Then sighing sinks away—no more it grieves—
Its own wild music soothing it to rest!
Let me, sweet spirit of the soft night-wind,
With thee sweet counsel hold. Like thee doth thought
Over the beautiful, fair earth depart,
The bright and precious in its course to find,
And with all-loving aspirations fraught,
Returns to bless the pure and peaceful heart.

## Art. VI.—THE FIVE POINTS OF CHRISTIAN FAITH.

It is at all times difficult, even for the wisest, to describe aright the tendencies of the age in which they live, and lay down its bearings on the great chart of human affairs. Our own sensations can give us no notice, whither we are going: and the infinite life-stream on which we ride, restless as it is with the surface-waves of innumerable events, reports nothing of the mighty current that sweeps us on, except by faint and silent intimations legible only to the skilled interpreter of heaven. It is something however to have the feeling *that we are moving*, and to be awake and looking out: and perhaps there never was a period in which this consciousness was more diffused throughout society than in our own. No one can look up and around at the religious and social phenomena of Christendom, without the persuasion, that we are entering a new hemisphere of the world's history;—a persuasion corroborated even by those who disclaim it, and who insist on steering still by lights of tradition now sinking into the mists of the receding horizon. Wherever we turn our eye, we discover some symptom of an impending revolution in the forms of Christian faith. The gross materialism and absolute unbelief diffused for the first time among vast masses of our population; the fast-spreading (and, as it appears to us, morbid) dislike to look steadily at anything miraculous, the extensive renunciation, even among the religious classes on the continent, of historical Christianity; the schisms and ever new peculiarities which are weakening all sects, and, like seedlings of the Reformation, are obscuring the species, by multiplying the varieties, of opinion; the revived controversies,—penetrating all the great political questions of the age,—between the ecclesiastical and civil powers, are not the only indications of approaching theological change. That very conservatism and recoil upon the high doctrine of an elder time, which is manifest in every section of the Christian world, is a confession by contrast of the same thing. For, opinion does not turn round and retreat into the past, till it has lost its natural shelter in the present, and dreads some merciless storm in the future. The outward strength which the older churches of our country seem to be acquiring, arises from the rallying of alarm and the herding together of trembling sympathies: and though fear may unite men against external assaults upon institutions, it cannot stop the decay of inward doubt. It would seem as if Christianity was threatened by the mental activity, which it has itself created: as if the intellectual weapons which

have been forged and tempered by its skill were treacherously turned against its life. It is vain however to strike a power that is immortal: nothing will fall but the bodily form cast for a season around the imperishable spirit. Protestantism, with all its blessings, has after all greatly disfigured Christianity, by constructing it into a rigid metaphysical form, and setting it up on a narrow pedestal of antiquarian proof;—by destroying its infinite character through definitions, and developing it dogmatically rather than spiritually;—by treating it, not as an ideal glory around the life of man, but a logical incision into the psychology of God. The wreck of systems framed under this false conception, will but leave the pure spirit of our religion in the enjoyment of a more sacred homage:—you may dash the image, but you cannot touch the god. In the following remarks we shall seek to make this evident;—to show what principles of religion in general, and of Christianity in particular, may be pronounced safe from the shocks of doubt. In times of consternation and uncertainty, it behoves each one to look within him for the heart of courage, and around him for the place of shelter, and to single out, amid countless points of danger, some refuge immutable and eternal. With this view, we propose to trace an outline of Christian truths which we consider secure and durable as our very nature;—a chain of granite points rising, like the rock of ages, above the shifting seas of human opinion. In doing so, we shall be simply delineating Unitarian Christianity, according to our conception of it;—expounding it, not as a barren negation, but as a scheme of positive religion; exhibiting both its characteristic faiths, and something of modes of thought by which they are reached.

I. In the first place, we have faith in the *Moral Perceptions of Man.* The conscience with which he is endowed enables him to appreciate the distinction between right and wrong; to understand the meaning of '*ought*' and '*ought not*;' to love and revere whatever is great and excellent in character, to abhor the mean and base; and to feel that in the contrast between these we have the highest order of differences by which mind can be separated from mind. And on this consciousness,—the basis of our whole responsible existence,—no suspicion is to be cast: no lamentation over its fallibility, no hint of possible delusion, is to pass unrebuked: it is worthy of absolute reliance as the authoritative oracle of our nature, supreme over all its faculties,—entitled to use sense, memory, understanding, to register its decrees, without a moment's licence to dispute them. That justice, mercy, and truth are good and venerable, is no matter of doubtful opinion, in which peradventure an error may be hid;—

is not even a thing of certain inference, recommended to us by the force of evidence;—is not an empirical judgment, depending on the pleasurableness of these qualities, and capable of reversal, if, under some tyrant sway, they were to be rendered miserable. The approval which we award to them is quite distinct from assent to a scientific probability: the excellence which we ascribe to them is not identical with their happiness, but altogether transcends this, precedes it, and survives it; the obligation they lay upon us is not the consequence of positive law, human or divine, or in any way the creature of superior will; for, all free-will must itself possess a moral quality,—can never stir without exercising it,—and cannot therefore give rise to that which is a prior condition of its own activity. And if (to pursue the thought suggested above) we could be snatched away to some distant world,—some out-province of the universe, abandoned by God's blessed sway to the absolutism of demons,—where selfishness and sensuality, and hate and falsehood, were protected and enjoined by public law, it is clear that, by such emigration, our interests only, and not our duties, would be reversed; and that to rebel and perish were nobler than to comply and live. The discernment of moral distinctions then belongs to the very highest order of certainties: it has its seat in our deepest reason, among the primitive strata of thought, on which the depositions of knowledge, and the accumulations of judgment, and the surface growths of opinion, all repose. As experience in the past has not taught it, experience in the future cannot *unteach* it. The difference between good and evil we cannot conceive to be merely relative, and incidental to our point of view,—variable with the locality and the class in which a being happens to rest,—an optical caprice of the atmosphere in which we live;—but rather a property of the very light itself, found every where out of the region of absolute night; or, at least, a natural impression, belonging to that perceptive eye of the soul, through which alone we can look out, as through a glass, upon all beings and all worlds; and if any one will say that the glass is coloured, it is, at all events, the tint of nature, shed on it by the ineffaceable art of the Creator. The modes in which we think of moral qualities are not terrestrial peculiarities of idea, like foreign prejudices: the terms in which we speak of them are not untranslatable provincial idioms, —vulgarities of our planetary dialect; but are familiar, like the symbols of a divine science, to every tribe of souls, belonging to the language of the universe, and standing defined in the vocabulary of God. The laws of right are more necessarily universal than the physical laws of force; and if the same agency of gravitation that governs the rain-drop determines the evolutions of

the sky, and the Principia of Newton would be no less intelligible and true on the ring of Saturn than in the libraries of this earth, —yet more certain is it, that the principles of moral excellence, truly expounded for the smallest sphere of responsibility, hold good, by mere extension, for the largest, and that those sentiments of conscience which may give order and beauty to the life of a child, constitute the blessedness of Immortals, and penetrate the administration of God. This is what we intend, when we insist on implicit faith in the moral perceptions of man. They are to be assumed by us as the fixed station, the grand heliocentric position, whence our survey of the spiritual universe must be made, and our system of religion constructed. Whatever else may move, here, as in creation's centre of gravity, we take our everlasting stand. Whatever else be doubtful, these are to be simply trusted. The force of certainty by which nature and God give them to the conscience exceeds any by which, either through the understanding or through external supernatural communication, they might *seem* to be drawn away. No revelation could persuade me that what I revere as just, and good, and holy, is *not venerable*, any more than it could convince me that the midnight heavens are not sublime.

There is nothing to move us from this position, in the objection, that different men have different ideas of right and wrong, and that the heroic deeds of one latitude are regarded as the crimes of another. This moral discrepancy is, in the first place, infinitely small in proportion to the moral agreement of mankind; so that it is even difficult to find many striking examples of it; and when the subject is mentioned, every body expects to hear the self-immolation of the Indian widow and other superstitions of the Ganges, adduced as the standing illustrations. What, after all, are these eccentricities of the moral sense, compared with the scale of its common consent?—as well might you deny the existence of an atmosphere, because you have found the air exhausted from a pump! Where is the nation or the individual, without the rudiments, however imperfectly unfolded, of the same great ideas of duty which we possess ourselves? Where the language, in which there are no terms to denote good and evil,—the just, the brave, the merciful? Where the tribe so barbarous as not to listen, with earnest eye, to the story of the good Samaritan?—and if such there were, should we not call them a people but little human (*inhuman*), and deem them, not the specimens, but the outlaws of our nature? Moreover, the variances of moral judgment are usually only apparent and external. The action which one man pronounces wrong and another right, is not the same, except upon the lips:

enter the minds of the two disputants, and you will find that it is only half taken into the view of each, and presents to them its opposite hemispheres; no wonder that it shows the darkness of guilt to the one, and the sunshine of virtue to the other. And accordingly, these differences actually vanish as the faculty of conscience unfolds itself, and the scope of the mind is enlarged. Like the discrepancies in the ideas which men have of beauty, they exist principally between the uncultivated and the refined: and the well-developed perceptions of the best in all ages and countries visibly agree. Nay, while yet the discordance lasts, it introduces no real doubt: for heaven has established a moral subordination among men, which reveals the real truth of our own nature. Do we not always see, that the lower conscience bows before the higher;—that the heart, without light or heat itself, may be pierced, as with a flash, by a sentiment darted from a loftier soul, and own it to be from above;—that, simply by this natural allegiance of the lesser to the nobler, classes and nations and sects are raised in dignity and moral greatness;—that they, and they only, have had any grand and sublime existence in the history of the world, who have been gifted with power to create a new religion,—a fresh development of what is holy and divine;—and that every one so endowed has always gathered around him the multitudes ever praying to be lifted above the level of their life, and blessing the benefactor who wakes up the consciousness of their higher nature? And if so, the general *direction* of the moral sentiment is the same, however its intensity may vary: and the irregular indications which it gives are not due to any inherent vacillation, but to the disturbing causes which deflect it from the celestial line of simplicity and truth.

We keep our foot, then, on this primitive foundation, faith in the moral perceptions of man. We say, that we know what we mean, when we affirm that a being is just, pure, disinterested, merciful; that these terms describe one particular kind of character, and one only; that they have the same sense to whomsoever they are applied, and are not to be juggled with, so as to denote quite opposite forms of action and disposition, according as our discourse may be of heaven or of earth; that whenever they lose their ordinary and intelligible signification, they become senseless; and that what would be wrong and odious in any one moral agent, can be,—under similar relations,—right and lovely in no other. These positions, which we take to be fundamental, are in direct contradiction to the theological maxims with which most churches begin; viz., that human nature is so depraved that its conscience has lost its discern-

ment, sees everything through a corrupted medium, and deserves no trust; that it may surrender its convictions to anything which can bring fair historical evidence of its being a revelation;—in other words, that it may be right to throw away our ideas of right, and, in obedience to antiquarian witnesses, suppose it holy in God to design and execute a scheme which it would be a crime in man to imitate. These principles are defended by the assertion, that the relations of the Divine and the human being are so different as to destroy all the analogies of character between them. The only tendency, both of this defence and of the principles themselves, is to absolute scepticism:—to *atheistical scepticism,* inasmuch as our propositions respecting God, if not true in the plain human sense, are to us true in no other, and represent *nothing;* to *moral scepticism,* inasmuch as the sentiments of conscience being exposed to distrust, and all its language rendered unsettled, the very ground on which human character must plant itself is loosened; the rock of duty melts into water beneath our feet, and we are cast into the waves of impulse and caprice.

II. We have faith in the *Moral Perfection of God.* This indeed is a plain consequence of our reliance on the natural sentiments of duty. For it is not, we apprehend, by our logical, but by our moral faculty, that we have our knowledge of God; and he who most confides in the instructor will learn the sacred lesson best. That One whom we may call the Holiest rules the universe is no discovery made by the intellect in its excursions, but a revelation found by the conscience on retiring into itself: and though we may reason in defence of this great truth, and these reasonings, when constructed, may look convincing enough, they are not, we conceive, the source, but rather the effect, of our belief;—not the forethought which actually precedes and introduces the faith, but the afterthought by which it seeks to make a friend and intimate of the understanding. Does any one hesitate to admit this, and think that our conceptions of the Divine character are inferences regularly drawn from observation,—not indeed observation on the mere physical arrangements, but on the moral phenomena, of our world,—from the traces of a regard to character in the administration of human life? We will not at present dispute the conclusion: but, observing that the premises which furnish it are certain *moral* experiences, we remark that the very power of receiving and appreciating these, of knowing what they are worth, belongs not to our scientific faculty, but to our sense of justice and of right; on a being destitute of this, they would make no impression; and in precise proportion to the intensity of this feeling, will

be the vividness and force of their persuasion. And is it not plain, *in fact*, that it is far from being the clear and acute intellect, but rather the pure and transparent heart, that best discerns God? How many strong and sagacious judgments, of coolest capacity for the just estimate of argument, never attain to any deep conviction of a perfect Deity! Nay, how much does scepticism on this great matter seem to be proportioned, not to the obtuseness, but rather to the subtlety and searchingness of the mere understanding! But when was it ever known that the singularly pure and simple heart, the earnest and aspiring conscience, the lofty and disinterested soul, had no faith in the "First fair and the First good?" Philosophy at its ease, apart from the real responsibilities and strong battle of life, loses its diviner sympathies, and lapses into the scrupulosity of doubt, and from the centre of comfort, weeps over the miseries of earth, and the questionable benevolence of heaven: while the practically tried and struggling, with moral force growing beneath the pressure of crushing toil, look up with a refreshing trust, and with worn and bleeding feet pant happily along to the abodes of everlasting love. The moral victor, flushed with triumph over temptation, feels that God is on his side, and that the spirit of the universe is in sympathy with his joy: and never did any one spend himself in the service of man, yet despair of the benignity of God. Our faith then in the Divine perfection forms and disengages itself from the deeps of conscience: and the Holiest that broods over us solemnly rises,—the awful Spirit of eternity,—from the ocean of our moral nature. It is in conformity with this doctrine of the *moral* origin of our belief in the first principles of religion, that to every man his God is *his best and highest*, the embodiment of that which the believer himself conceives to be the greatest. The image which he forms of that Being may indeed be gross and terrible: and others may be shocked, and exclaim that he trusts, not in a Divinity, but in a Fiend: but will the worshipper himself perceive and acknowledge this? will he not indignantly deny it? will he not eagerly vindicate the perfection of the Deity he serves? He can do no otherwise; for he discerns nothing more sublime, and cannot be convinced that *that* is low, which stands at the summit of his thoughts. This uniform phenomenon in the history of religion could not exist, if human faith were an inference of intellectual origin. There would be nothing *then* to prevent some men, in their reasonings on the probable character of God, from assigning to that character a place *beneath* their own conceptions of what is most excellent; and amid the infinite varieties of speculation, many

forms of this opinion would undoubtedly arise. Let any one then who dissents from the account which we have given ask himself this question;—why is it, that to discover a blemish in a divinity is the same thing as to renounce faith in him; and that, even in Pagan times, to *assail the character* of the gods was the constant mark of an *unbelieving* age? Is it not clear that, by a constraining necessity of our being, we are compelled to regard the godlike and the perfect as identical, and to look to heaven through the eye of our moral nature. The Intellect alone, like the telescope waiting for an observer, is quite blind to the celestial things above it,—a dead mechanism dipped in night:—ready to serve as the dioptric glass, spreading the images of light from the Infinite on the tender and living retina of Conscience.

If then there is no discernment of Deity, except through our moral sense, the importance of confiding in the perceptions of that sense,—of rendering our consciousness of them vivid and distinct,—and the corresponding mischief of distrusting and repudiating these our appointed instructors, become evident. Faith in the human conscience is necessary to faith in the Divine perfection: and *this* again is the needful prelude to the belief in any special revelation. For, unless we are first assured of the truth and excellence of God, we cannot tell that his communications may not deceive us, giving us false notices of things, and agitating us with illusory hopes and fears. This might be apprehended from a Being of undetermined benevolence and integrity: and that this idea of a *mendacious revelation* has never seriously entered the minds of men, is a strong proof of their natural and necessary faith in the rectitude and goodness of the Divine Administrator of creation. This Moral Perfection of God being assumed as a postulate in the very idea of a Revelation, no system of religion which contradicts it can be admitted as credible *on any terms.*

Now the whole scheme of Redemption, as it is represented in the popular theology, appears to us to fall under this condemnation. Under the *names* of justice, sanctity, mercy, it ascribes to the All-perfect a course of sentiment and practice which,—it is undeniable,—no other moral agent, placed in analogous relations, could adopt without the deepest guilt. The Holiness of God, so often adduced to justify the severities of this scheme, we would yield to no one in earnestly maintaining; believing as we do that his abhorrence of moral evil is absolute and everlasting, his resistance to it real and true,—and his love of excellence simply infinite as his nature. But purity of mind does not express itself by implacable vengeance against the impure, or

oblige its possessor to engage himself in physically smiting them, —much less limit him through all eternity to this mode of administration. Rather does it incline away from a treatment which too often adds only torment and removes no guilt,—which makes no advance towards the blessed dispositions it loves,— which fevers and parches instead of cooling and melting the passions of a culprit nature. It is a coarse and wretched error to suppose that anguish is a specific for sin, to the incessant infliction of which the Sinless is bound. God never departs indeed from his devotion to the laws of goodness, and his design of calling wider and wider virtue into existence: but he pursues them with the fertility of his infinite Freewill; now by the severities of his displeasure, now by the openness of his forgiveness, now by the solicitations of his love. His purpose, as one whose moral perfection is not merely spotless, but active and productive, cannot be, as some Christians seem to say, the penal publication of his personal offence against the insulters of his law, but the spread and cultivation throughout his spiritual universe of pure and high affections: and whenever the new germs of these appear in the garden of the Lord, no vernal sunshine or summer dews can more gently cherish the bursting flower, than does his mercy foster the fair and early growth. The assertion that God cannot pardon and recal to goodness till he has expended his tortures upon the evil, seems to us a plain denial of his moral excellence. Theologians speak as if there were some crime, or at least some weakness, in the clemency which freely receives a repentant creature into favour; as if the mercy which exacts no penalty, when penalty is no longer needed, were an amiable imbecility of human nature, which only a loose-principled and unholy being can exercise; as if absolute unforgivingness were the perfection of sanctity. True, this is disclaimed in words; and the eternal Father is called merciful, for remitting the sinner's doom and transferring the burthen of his guilt to a victim divine and pure. But surely this disclaimer is more insulting to our moral sense than the accusation. For, either this transference of righteousness and guilt is a mere figure of speech, denoting only that, from the death on Calvary, God took chronological occasion to pass his own spontaneous pardon, and set up the cross to *mark the date* of his volition; or else, if the vicariousness be not this mere pretence, it describes an outrage upon the first principles of rectitude, a reckless disregard of all moral considerations, from the thought of which we are astonished that all good men do not recoil. We press once more the question which has never been answered;—how is the alleged immorality of letting off the sinner mended by the added crime of

penally crushing the Sinless? Of what man, of what angel, could such a thing be reported, without raising a cry of indignant shame from the universal human heart? What should we think of a judge who should discharge the felons from the prisons of a city, because some noble and generous citizen offered himself to the executioner instead? And if this would be barbarity below, it cannot be holiness above. Moral excellence and beauty, we repeat, are no local growths, changing their species with every clime; nor are the poisonous weeds of this outer region the chosen adornments of Paradise. The principles of justice and right embrace all beings and all times, and, like the indestructible conception of Space, attach themselves to our contemplation of objects within the remotest infinitude. It is no more possible that what would be evil in man should be good in God, than that a circle on earth should be a square in heaven. Having faith then in the absolute perfection of our Creator, we dare ascribe to him nothing which revolts the secret conscience he has given us.

III. The relation which thus subsists between the human conscience and the Divine excellence leads us to avow, in the next place, a faith in the strictly *divine and inspired character of our own highest desires and best affections.* We do not mean by this, that these affections are of miraculous origin; that their appearance breaks through any regular law; or that they do not belong to our own nature so as to form an integrant part of its history; or that they do not arise spontaneously within it, and require to be precipitated upon it from without. They are as much properties of our own minds, as our selfishness and sin: we are *conscious* of them, and so they cannot but be parts of our personality.* But in admitting them to be human, I do not deny

* Perhaps we should rather say "they cannot be alien to our nature." The word "*personality*" is used by philosophical writers to denote that which is *peculiar*, as well as essential, to our individual self. In this strict sense, the moral and spiritual affections are *impersonal*, according to the doctrine of the context, which treats them as constituting a participation in the Divine nature. The metaphysical reader will perhaps perceive here a resemblance to the theory of Victor Cousin, who maintains that the *will*,—"*the free and voluntary activity*,"—of the human being is the specific faculty in which alone consists his "*personality*;" and that the intuitive reason by which we have knowledge of the unlimited and Absolute Cause, as well as of ourselves and the universe as related effects, is independent and impersonal;—a faculty not peculiar to the subject, but "from the bosom of consciousness extending to the Infinite, and reaching to the Being of beings." "Reason," observes this philosopher, "is intimately connected with personality and sensibility, but it is neither the one nor the other: and precisely because it is neither the one nor the other, because it is in us without being ourselves, does it reveal to us that which is not ourselves, objects beside the subject itself, and which lie beyond its sphere." At the opposite pole to this doctrine, which makes the perceptions of "Reason" a part of the activity of God, lies the system of Kant and Fichte, which represents God as an ideal formation,—it may be therefore a *fiction*,—from the activity of the "Reason." This faculty is treated

that they are divine: in regarding them as indigenous to our created spirit, I do not treat them as foreign to the Creator's; nor is there any inconsistency in believing them to be simultaneously domesticated with both. That which is *included within* the mind of man, is not *therefore excluded from* the mind of *God*; much less is it true, that occurrences agreeable to the order of nature are, by that circumstance, disqualified for being held the immediate products of the heavenly will. The Supreme Cause, so far from being shut out by his own secondary causes and natural laws, has now at least no residence, no activity, no existence, except within them; he covers, penetrates, fills them; thinks, speaks, executes, through them, as the media of his volition: and his energy and theirs not only *may coincide*, but even *must coalesce*. He is not to be brought down from his universal dominion to the rank of *one of* the physical causes active in creation, doing that only which the others have left undone. Will any one stand with me by the midnight sea, and because the tides in the deep below hang upon the moon in the heavens above, forbid me to hear in their sweep the very voice of God, and tell me that, while they roll untired on, He sleeps through the silent vault around me? It is by the law of gravitation that the planets find an unerring track in the desert space; and is it false then that he "leadeth them forth with his finger," and bids us note, in pledge of his punctuality, that "not one faileth?" Is there any error in ascribing the very same event at one time to gravitation, at another to God? Certainly not; for this is but one of the forms of his personal activity. And it is the same in the world of mind; its natural laws do not exclude, but on the contrary include, the direct Divine agency: and though *my* thought, or hope, or love, cannot be *yours*, they may yet be God's; not emanations from the God without us, but inspirations of the God within. Why should we start to think that there is a part of us which is divine? Why image to ourselves a distant, external, contemplative God, seeing all things and touching nothing, gazing on the uncon-

by these German philosophers as merely *subjective and personal*; its perceptions, even when they seem to go beyond itself, are known only as internal conditions and results of self-activity; its beliefs, though inevitable to itself, are simply relative, and have no objective validity. The faiths and affections which this system regards as purely human, are considered by the other as divine. The doctrine maintained above, though resembling that of Kant in one or two of its phrases, far more nearly approaches that of Cousin in its spirit. It is scarcely necessary to observe that, in this note, the word "Reason" is used, not as equivalent to "Understanding," but in the German sense, so long rendered familiar to the English reader by the writings of Mr. Coleridge. It includes therefore (in its two senses of "*Speculative*" and "*Practical*,") the "Moral Perceptions," and "Primitive faiths of the Conscience," spoken of in the text.

scious evolutions of things, as the retired mechanist of nature? Why enthrone him in the inertness of dead space, without even a sacred function there, and exclude him from the tried, and tempted, and ever-trembling soul of man? If we found him not at home in the secret places of strife and sorrow, vainly should we wander to seek him in the colder regions of nature abroad. We have no sympathy with any system which denies the doctrine of a Holy Spirit; which discerns nothing divine in the higher experiences of human nature; which owns no black abyss and no heavenly heights in the soul of man, but only a flat, common, midway region, neither very foul nor very fair,—well enough for the streets of traffic, but without a mount of vision and of prayer. Nothing noble, nothing great, has ever come from a faith which did not deeply reverence the soul, and stand in awe of it as the seat of God's own dwelling, the presence-chamber of his sanctity,—the focus of that infinite whispering-gallery which the universe spreads around us.

Nor can we doubt at what point of our own nature we must stand in order to hear the voice, and feel the inspiration, of the Eternal. The pure in heart,—each in proportion to his purity, —see him. Our conscience, our moral perceptions, as we have seen, are our only revealers of God. In proportion to their clearness do we discern him; and behind the clouds that obscure them, he becomes dim, and vanishes away. The aspirations of duty, the love of excellence, the disinterested and holy affections, of which every good heart is conscious, constitute our affinity with him; by which we know him, as like knows like: they are the expression of his mind,—the pencil of rays by which he paints his image on our spiritual nature. God is related to our soul, like the sun in a stormy sky to the windowed cells in which mortals live; and as we sit at our work in the chamber of conscience or of love, the burst of brilliancy or the sudden gloom within reports to us the clear-shining or the cloud of the heaven without. Nor can any philosophy, falsely so called, permanently expel this conviction from the christian heart. Every devout and earnest mind naturally feels that its selfishness and sin are of the earth, earthy;—the most offensive of all attitudes to God;—the infatuated turning of the back to him: and, on the other hand, welcomes the fresh glow of pure resolve, the heart-felt sob of penitence, the glorious courage that slays temptation at his feet,—as the gracious gift of a divine strength, and the authentic voice of the Inspirer, God. By this natural faith (natural, however, only to the Christian mind) we are prepared to abide; and, with the apostle Paul, to own ourselves, not without deep awe, the very temple of the Holiest.

IV. We have said that in the conscience and moral affections we have our *only* revealers of God. Let it be understood that we mean our only *internal* revealers of him;—the only faculty of our nature capable of furnishing us with the idea and belief of him, with any perception of his character and allegiance to his will. We mean to state that, without this faculty, the bare intellect, the mere scientific and reasoning power, could make no way towards the knowledge of divine realities; could never, by any system of helps whatsoever, be trained or guided into this knowledge, any more than, in the absense of the proper sense, the *ear* of the blind can be taught *to see*; and that nature, life, history, miracle, notwithstanding their most sedulous discipline, would leave us utterly in the dark about religion, except so far as they addressed themselves to our consciousness of what is holy, just, beautiful, and great. But we do *not* mean to state, that the moral sense can stand alone, dispense with all outward instruction, and supply a man with a natural religion ready-made. Nor do we mean, that the every-day experience of man, and the ordinary providence of God, are enough, without special revelation, to lead us to heavenly truth. And we are therefore prepared to advance another step, and to say, that, while regarding the human conscience as the only inward revealer of God, we have faith in Christ, as his *perfect and transcendant outward revelation.* We conceive that Jesus of Nazareth lived and died, not to *persuade* the Father, not to *appease* the Father, not to make a sanguinary *purchase* from the Father, but simply to "*show* us the Father;" to leave upon the human heart a new, deep, vivid impression of what God is in himself, and of what he designs for his creature, man; to become, in short, the accepted interpreter of heaven and life. And this he achieved, in the only way of which we can conceive as practicable, by a new disclosure in his own person of all that is holy and godlike in character; startling the human soul with the sudden apparition of a being diviner far than it had yet beheld; and lifting its faith at once into quite another and purer region. If it be true, as we have ventured to affirm, that to every man his God is his *best,* you can by no means give to his faith a *higher God,* till you have given to his heart a *better best*; till you have touched him with a profounder sense of sanctity and excellence, and purified and enlarged the perceptions of his conscience. Nor can you do *this,* except by presenting him with nobler models, with the living form of a fairer and sublimer goodness, visibly transcending every object of his previous reverence. No verbal teaching, no didactic rules, can transform any man's moral taste, and place before his mental

view a lovelier and truer image of perfection: as well might you hope, by definition, and precept, and book-wisdom, to train an artist with a soul like Raffaelle, or an eye like Claude. But only give the glorious model to the mind, *produce* the most finished excellence and harmony, and our instinctive sympathy with goodness feels and discerns it instantly, and, though unable to conceive it inventively beforehand, recognises it reverently afterwards. And so Christ, standing in solitary greatness, and invested with unapproachable sanctity, opens at once the eye of conscience to perceive and know the pure and holy God, the Father that dwelt in him and made him so full of truth and grace. Him that rules in heaven we can in no wise believe to be *less perfect* than that which is most divine on earth; of any thing *more perfect* than the meek yet majestic Jesus, no heart can ever dream. And accordingly, ever since he visited our earth with blessing, the soul of Christendom has worshipped a God resembling him, a God of whom he was the image and impersonation: and *therefore, not* the God of which philosophy dreams,—a mere Infinite physical Force, without spirituality, without love, chiefly engaged in whirling the fly-wheel of nature, and sustaining the material order of the heavens, and weaving in the secret workshop of creation new textures of life and beauty; *not* the God of which natural theology speaks, the mere chief of ingenious mechanicians, more optical, and dynamical, and architectural, than our most skilful engineers,—a cold intellectual Being, in the severe immensity and immutability of whose mind all warm emotions are absorbed and dissolved; *not* the God of Calvinism, creating a race with certain foresight of the eternal damnation of the many, and against the few refusing to relax his frown except at the spectacle of blood:—but the Infinite Spirit, so holy, so affectionate, so pitiful, whom Jesus felt to be in him as his Inspirer; who passes no wounds of sin or sorrow by; who stills the winds and waves of terror, to the perishing that call on him in faith: who stops the procession of our grief, and bids bereaved affection weep no more, but wait upon the voice that e'en the dead obey; who scathes the hypocrite with the lightning of conviction, and permits the penitent to wash his feet with tears; who reckons most his own the gentlest follower, that rests the head, and turns up the trustful eye on him; and bends the look of piercing love upon the guilty that best rebukes the guilt. Jesus has given us a faith never held before, and still too much obscured, in the *affectionateness* of the Great Ruler; has made him our own domestic God, whose ample home encircles all, leaving not the solitary, the sinner, or the sad, without a place

in the mansions of his house; has wrapped us in the Divine immensity without fear, and bid us claim the warm sun in heaven as our Paternal hearth, and the vault of the pure sky as our protecting roof.

We have spoken of Christ's personal representation, in his own character and practical life, of the spirit of the Divine Mind, and have explained how in this way we believe that he has "shown us the Father." This however is not all. His *direct teachings*, perfectly in harmony with his life, confirm and extend its lessons; and we listen, with venerating faith, to his inimitable exposition of all divine truth. Purity of soul makes the most wonderful discoveries in heavenly things; and is indeed the pellucid atmosphere through which the remoter lights of God are "spiritually discerned." As we have said, the knowledge of him which any mind (be it of man or of angel) may possess, is just proportioned to its sanctity: and our Messiah, having the very highest sanctity, was enabled to speak with the highest and most authoritative knowledge; and was inspired to be our infallible guide, not perhaps in trivial questions of literary interpretation, or scientific fact, or historical expectation, but in all the deep and solemn relations on which our sanctification and immortal blessedness depend. And both to his person and to his teachings, do the miracles of his life, the tragedy of his crucifixon, and the glory of his resurrection, articulately call the attention of all ages, as with the voice of God. In every way we discern in Christ the transcendant revelation of the Most High. We are told, that this is to *dishonour Christ*. We think it however a more glorious honour to him, to be thus indissolubly folded within the intimacy of the Father's love, than to be blasted by the tempest of his wrath; nor could we ever trust and venerate a God who,—like the barbarians in the judgment-hall,—could smite that meek lamb of heaven with one rude blow of vengeance.

V. But we hasten to observe, finally, that we have faith in human Immortality, as exemplified in the heavenly life to which Jesus ascended. To assure us of this great truth, it were enough that Jesus assumed and taught it; that it was his great postulate, essential to the development of his own character, and to all his views of the purposes of life; an integrant part of his insight into human responsibility and his version of human duty. For if *he* did not teach the reality of God in this matter, sure we are that none else has ever done so; and most of all, that the sceptics who doubt the heavenly futurity have no claim to take his place as our instructors. For if this hope were a delusion, *who* would the mistaken be? Will any one tell me, that

the voluptuary, who, from abandonment to the body, cannot imagine the perpetuity of the spirit;—that the selfish, who, looking at the meanness of his own nature, sees nothing worth immortalizing;—that the contented Epicurean, who in prudent quietude of sense and sympathy finds adequate satisfaction in this mortal life; that the cold speculator, who looks at the fouler side of human nature, and, showing us on its features the pallor of sensualism or the hard lines of guilt, deems it less fit for the duration of the angel than for the extinction of the brute;—that these men are *right*; while Christ, who walked without despair through the deepest haunts of sin, with faith that succumbed not to wretchedness and wrong, but stood up and conquered them; who embraced our whole nature in his love, and displayed it in its perfectness; who lived and died in its utmost service, with prayers and tears, and blood; to whom our most binding affections cling almost with worship as the holiest glory of our world;—that *he* could be under a delusion *here?* that when, sinking in trustful death, he laid his meek head to rest on the bosom of the Father, he was cast off, and dropped on the cold clod? that he sobbed into the Infinite by night with a vain love that met no answer? that God rather takes part in his Providence with the mean-souled, the cynic, the morbid, the selfish? There *is* no greater impossibility than this, on which evidence can fall back. Nay, we confess that, even apart from his doctrine, the mere mortal history of Christ would have settled with us the question of futurity. For, the great essential to this belief is, a sufficiently elevated estimate of human nature: no man will ever deny its immortality who has a deep impression of its capacity for so great a destiny. And this impression is so vividly given by the life of Jesus,—he presents an image of the soul so grand, so divine, as utterly to dwarf all the dimensions of its present career, and to necessitate a heaven for its reception. At all events it is allowable to feel this, when we see that this natural sequel was actually and perceptibly appended; that this "Holy one of God could not see corruption;" but rose, above the reach of mortal ill, to the world where now he welcomes the souls of the sainted dead. That other life we take to be a scene for the mind's ampler and ampler development, apart from those animal and selfish elements which now deform and degrade it by their excess. And this alone, if there were nothing else, would render it a life of awful retribution. For to the wicked, what is this loss of "the natural man," but total bereavement and utter death of joy?—what to the good, but a glad and sacred birth?—to the one, a Promethean exile on a mid-rock in the ocean of night, under the bite of a re-

morse that gnaws impalpably, felt always but never seen;—to the other, a welcome to the loving homes of the blest, amid the sunshine of the everlasting hills? Yet precisely because we believe in Retribution, do we trust in Restoration. The very abhorrence with which a man's better mind ever looks upon his worse, while it inflicts his punishment, begins his cure: and we can never allow that God will suspend this natural law impressed by himself on our spiritual constitution, merely in order to stop the process of moral recovery, and specially enable him to maintain the eternity of torment and of sin. And so, beyond the dark close of life rise before us the awful contrasts of retribution; and in the further distance, the dim but glorious vision of a purified, redeemed, and progressive universe of souls.

Here then are our five points of Christianity, considered as a system of positive religious doctrine: viz. 1st, The truth of the Moral Perceptions in man,—not, as the degenerate churches of our day teach, their pravity and blindness; 2ndly, The Moral Perfection of the character of God,—in opposition to the doctrine of his Arbitrary Decrees and Absolute Self-will; 3rdly, The Natural awakening of the Divine Spirit within us,—rather than its Præternatural communication from without; 4thly, Christ, the pure Image and highest Revelation of the eternal Father,—not his Victim and his Contrast; 5thly, a universal Immortality after the model of Christ's heavenly life; an immortality, not of capricious and select salvation, with unimaginable torment as the general lot,—but, for all, a life of spiritual development, of retribution, of restoration. To the *Moral* doctrine which, in our view, the gospel conjoins with this religious system it is impossible for us at present to advert. Suffice to say that, with Paul, we exclaim, "not *Law*, but *Love*:"—love to God, to Christ, not simply for what they have done for us, but chiefly for what they are in themselves;—nothing like the narrow-hearted gratitude for an exclusive salvation, but a *moral* affection awakened by their holiness, rectitude, truth and mercy,—by the sublimity and spirituality of their designs, and the sanctity and fidelity of their execution: love also to man, looking to him not merely as a sentient being who is to be made *happy*, but as a child of God, who is to be raised into some likeness to the Divine image; as a brother-spirit noble in nature, even though sinful in fact, glorious as an immortal in the eye of God, though disfigured by this world's hardship or contempt.

Does any one ask, *where we get* our system of faith and morals? What are the principles of reasoning which we apply to nature and scripture to extract it thence? The reply would

require a volume of exposition. Suffice to say, that we think we have full warrant for this belief from the scriptures of the New Testament, with which alone we conceive that Christians have any practical concern; that in interpreting these Scriptures, we follow the same rules which we should apply to any other books; that not even could their instructions make us false to that sense of right and wrong which God has breathed into us; that if they taught respecting him anything unjust or unholy, we should not accept *it* but reject *them*; and that as to the points of faith on which we have dwelt, some receive these truths because they were taught by Christ; others receive Christ, because he taught these truths.

On this faith we desire to take our stand, with the firmness, and without the ferocity, of the first Reformers. Opposing churches tell us, we "are so frigid!"—Why, 'tis the very thing our own hearts had often said to us; for there is nothing that so promptly rebukes the coldness of our nature as the warmth of our faith. We do not however much admire this mutual criticism of each other's temperature; and strongly suspect the reality of that earnestness which prides itself on its own intensity. We must not propose to assume any artificial heats, in order to spite and disprove this frequent accusation; but be resolved, in an age diseased with pretence, to remain realities; to profess nothing which we do not believe, to withhold nothing whereon we doubt, to affect nothing which we do not feel, to promise nothing which we will not do; holding, with Paul, that simplicity and sincerity are truly the godliest of things. With heaven's good help, may we bear our testimony thus: deeming it a small thing to be judged by man's judgment; and with such light and heat as God shall put into our hearts, delivering over our portion of truth to generations that will give it a more genial welcome. There is greatness in a faith, when it can win a wide success or make rapid conquest over submissive minds. There is a higher greatness in a faith that, when God ordains, can stand up and do without success;—unmoved amid the pitiless storms of a fanatic age; with foot upon the rock of its own fidelity, and heart in the serene Infinite above the canopy of cloud and tempest.

M.

ART. VII.—A DISCOURSE ON THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF THE REV. JOSEPH TUCKERMAN, D.D.—Delivered at the Warren Street Chapel, on Sunday Evening, Jan. 31, 1841, by WILLIAM E. CHANNING, D.D. Boston: William Crosby and Co. London: John Green, 121, Newgate Street.

WE must unburthen ourselves of something of what we have felt in reading this delightful effusion. It has been long since we have read anything that has given us such pleasure. This discourse must not be confounded with what are commonly called funeral sermons. Neither is it a funeral oration, or a panegyric. It belongs to none of them, and yet it touches upon them all. It is the Moral Portrait of a Christian by the first living Christian Master. The lines are struck forth with equal firmness and freedom; the colours are laid on with as much brilliance as delicacy; and the expression of the whole—that indefinable and indispensable something, by the presence of which genius is proved, and by the kind and degree of which it is tested—is so affectionate and endearing, so truly benign and beautiful, so clear with truth, and so radiant with holiness and love, that we should imagine it impossible for any one to lay down this little record without saying to himself, "And I too am a Christian! Why is this man's life so unlike my own?"

This power of imparting the love of what he loves is, we think, a very peculiar and distinctive quality of Dr. Channing's writings. He found little to love in Napoleon's dazzling character; and, accordingly, we rise from the perusal of his estimate of it without any dangerous glow of enthusiasm for the Man of Austerlitz and of Lodi. But his reverence for Milton was a settled passion of his soul; and his analysis of the great poet's life and genius communicated, not only the conception, but the participation of his feelings. His sympathy for the character of the gentle and noble Fenelon was obviously a portion of his own heart and life; and he imparted it accordingly,—he multiplied the lovers of Fenelon with every copy of his calm yet glowing delineation. And in treating of a character yet superior to them all,—to which Napoleon's greatness is imbecility, which eclipses in act the sublimities of Milton's song, and which rises above even the last delightful character by a superiority so vast, that even Fenelon's love seems *human*, when compared with the love of CHRIST,—in treating of this, the heavenliest character of Earth, he has, we think, preserved the same high peculiarity,

and made the love which he describes, not only a communicated impression of the moment, but, in many, very many, cases, a transferred and independent affection of the soul. This it is, and nothing so much as this, that gives us our value for the writings of Dr. Channing. They *impart* the love which they express. They do not excite only, but *conduct*, the ethereal fire. And, in the paper before us, this high distinction is preserved. We have a portrait of Dr. Tuckerman, such as not only makes us say, "This man shall have a place in our list of true philanthropists and Christians," but,—returning to the mental comment stated in substance before,—"How divine a thing is the philanthropy of Christianity! We are thankful, that it is not yet too late to go and do likewise."

We do not mean, of course, that the reading of this paper will send men forth upon a mission like that of Dr. Tuckerman. We must expect, that, as yet, such angel visits will be few and far between; and that, even among those who devote themselves to his peculiar ministry, few will be found who enter it with such a full and glorious sense of the mortality of evil, and the omnipotence of Good. What we mean is, that these writings have a direct tendency to produce that spirit which makes life itself more Christian in all its connections and communions,—with rich and poor, with home and society, with Man and with Heaven. We envy not *his* feelings, who, under such a flood of hallowing and revealing light, sees no dim or dark places in himself, which it is fitted to penetrate and to purify. We value them, not because they were uttered from an influential pulpit, not because they have received the applause of two hemispheres, but because we feel that a virtue goes out of them to make Christianity itself more beloved, and the life of the follower of Jesus more guided by the spirit of his Master. These works are dear to us, neither for their eloquence nor for their fame, but, mainly and growingly for their *Christianizing* power.

We love to trace what appears to us to be the self-interpretings of Providence. In a world, where so much is dark, we rejoice when we see breaks and gleamings of what strikes us as distinct providential light. Such appears to us to be the synchronism and juxta-position of two such minds as those of Tuckerman and Channing. They mutually gave, and reflected light; and that light was indeed light from heaven. We disclaim any ungenerous desire to depreciate the literary productions of Dr. Tuckerman. They contain a rich mass both of the Beautiful and the Useful. They are precious and indispensable studies for the philanthropist and the Christian. We trust they will never perish; and we should think it a bad prognostic for

society if they were ever in danger of perishing. But with all this, we imagine that the most important light thrown upon this excellent man's character and life has *not* come from his own writings. We owe our own highest appreciation of them to Dr. Channing. We confess that, personally strangers as we were to this distinguished Christian, we should not have conceived of him, from his own writings so noble, or we believe so correct, an opinion, as we have derived from those of his surviving contemporary and friend; and, in particular, from the Discourse which is now before us. We now believe that we *know* Dr. Tuckerman. We have him before us, not as a character free from the clinging frailties of humanity, but as One, in whom those frailties were lost in the glory that a great and holy purpose threw around him, and which made his whole course bright with a light that was not of this world. The Providence, which raised up the Agent of this purpose, seems to us to have raised up also the fellow-being who was to explain the principles of its agency. Dr. Tuckerman never did justice to himself or to his cause. He never *could* have done so. It was a hopeless impossibility. He could no more have done so, than Raffaelle could have done justice to the Ideal of Beauty within him, or Dante to his own conception of the Simple and the Terrible, or Shakspere to his own vast grasp of the general and the particular, the infinite and the infinitismal, in the Universe (his own reign) of Human Nature and Character. In the present case, Dr. Channing has supplied the great deficiency. He has applied his own intimacy with his departed friend to the delicate and important task of developing the finer mysteries of his character, the modes of his operation, and the sources of his power. And he has done this in such a loving, and honouring, and self-forgetting spirit, that the beauty of this brotherhood of fine Christian Minds comes out upon us with a force that we cannot express, and, in endeavouring to express which, we feel, with shrinking and throbbing hearts, the feebleness of Words, when they have such Truth to deal with.

The eye, which sees all other beauty, sees not its own. The mind, which feels the warmest and the widest love, rarely finds or makes leisure to describe the intensity or the extent of what it feels. Strong passion leads less to expression than to action. Love pours itself into works, while it oversweeps all words. Thus it is, that some of the greatest philosophers and philanthropists have written little or nothing on the subject of philosophy or philanthropy. Socrates wrote nothing. Christ wrote nothing. Possibly he *could* not write;—but if he could write, and had written, we are convinced that a less perfect idea of his Charac-

ter would have been conveyed by his own writings, than we have received of it from the impressions and effects of his own life upon others. With a fine and reverent touch—with a full sense of the disparities—we would compare one of the best of the followers of CHRIST with his Master. In doing this we do neither wrong. Our friend "sleepeth;" and, had Jesus stood by his grave, we should have had to exclaim, on witnessing his emotion, "Behold, how he loved him!" We say, then, that as the idea we have formed of the character and life of Jesus,—derived, as it is, from the impressions made by them upon his disciples, is more complete and satisfactory than any which he himself could have imparted; so the character and life of the true Christian of whom we are speaking, have been revealed to us in a much more ample and luminous manner, by the pen of his wise and sympathizing contemporary, than they could have been by his own, even though he had had equal power in the use of it. And we hope we shall be forgiven if we call this *a Providence*, in something more than the loose and common acceptation of the term. We cannot refer it to a mere fortuitous coincidence. We cannot regard it as the ordinary and casual falling-in of one gifted mind with another. It was a great, a complex, and a far-extending Want, suited with its correspondent and proportionate Supply. It was—at least it seems to us—a rare Providential Agency, needing an Interpreter, and unconsciously drawing one to itself, and carrying him along with it. And if, in our thus speaking of the surviving friend as the *disciple* of the lost one, there be anything that may give offence to a certain class of his admirers, we would remind them (though to *them* we are not writing) that this is the light in which, with affecting ingenuousness and simplicity, Dr. Channing constantly shows us that he regards *himself*. He is content to place his Intellect at the footstool of his friend's Heart. He constantly refers to their long and lovely intercourse in the character of a *heart-disciple*. We would not interfere with a representation, whose beauty lies in its truth. If Dr. Channing saw, in his lamented brother, one of the rarest and finest Incarnations of Christianity, we would join with him in his reverence for it, without any wish to remove him, under the vain idea of *raising* him, from the attitude in which he has placed himself to express it.

In these last remarks, we have been referring, not to this Discourse alone, but to no inconsiderable portion of Dr. Channing's printed writings, which was either composed expressly for the furtherance of the Ministry at Large, or is imbued with the very spirit which called it forth, and which alone can sus-

tain it. We have no doubt whatever, that Dr. Channing would unhesitatingly ascribe the peculiar and sustained interest, which he has long taken in the subject, to the "communications which he had by the way" with the Friend to whom his sympathy was of such inestimable help and value. And it is from *the whole* of these writings—inclusive of this last censer of incense, kindled by Christian Genius at the altar of Christian Love—that we estimate the worth at which the living Friend prized the character and labours of the fine spirit that has gone to its home, and to what an extent he felt the high theophilanthropy of a being, who, instead of complaining of having "fallen on evil days and evil men," gathered to him, in the nineteenth age, so much of the Spirit of Christ, and put it into act in a life so nearly resembling the life of an Apostle. We know not, on recalling what we have read or heard of their beautiful intercourse, which of the parties was the more benefited by its influences; but we believe that the eye of the GREAT FATHER must look down with serene and sublime approval upon such rare and hallowed communions, and that another life will renew them with "thoughts that wander through eternity."

Passing on to the Discourse itself, we are arrested at the very outset by the following striking remarks on the true Dignity and Duty of Society:

"The glory and happiness of a city consist not in the number, but the character of its population. Of all the fine arts in a city, the grandest is the art of forming noble specimens of humanity. The costliest productions of our manufactures are cheap, compared with a wise and good human being. A city, which should practically adopt the principle, that man is worth more than wealth or show, would gain an impulse that would place it at the head of cities. A city, in which men should be trained worthy of the name, would become the metropolis of the earth.

"God has prospered us, and, as we believe, is again to prosper us in our business; and let us show our gratitude by inquiring for what end prosperity is given, and how it may best accomplish the end of the giver. Let us use it to give a higher character to our city, to send refining, purifying influences through every department of life. Let us especially use it, to multiply good influences in those classes which are most exposed to temptation. Let us use it to prevent the propagation of crime from parent to child. Let us use it in behalf of those in whom our nature is most depressed, and who, if neglected, will probably bring on themselves the arm of penal law. Nothing is so just a cause of self-respect in a city, as the healthy, moral condition of those who are most exposed to crime. This is the best proof, that the prosperous classes are wise, intelligent, and worthy of their prosperity. Crime is to the State what dangerous disease is to the human frame, and to expel

it should be to the community an object of the deepest concern. This topic is so important, that I cannot leave it without urging it on your serious thoughts.

"Society has hitherto employed its energy chiefly to punish crime. It is infinitely more important to prevent it; and this I say not for the sake of those alone on whom the criminal preys. I do not think only or chiefly of those who suffer from crime. I plead also, and plead more, for those who perpetrate it. In moments of clear, calm thought, I feel more for the wrong doer than for him who is wronged. In a case of theft, incomparably the most wretched man is he who steals, not he who is robbed. The innocent are not *undone* by acts of violence or fraud from which they suffer. They are innocent, though injured. They do not bear the brand of infamous crime; and no language can express the import of this distinction. When I visit the cell of a convict, and see a human being who has sunk beneath his race, who is cast out by his race, whose name cannot be pronounced in his home, or only pronounced to start a tear, who has forfeited the confidence of every friend, who has lost that spring of virtue and effort, the hope of esteem, whose conscience is burdened with irreparable guilt, who has hardened himself against the appeals of religion and love, here, here I see a Ruin. The man whom he has robbed or murdered, how much happier than he! What I want is, not merely that society should protect itself against crime, but that it shall do all that it can to preserve its exposed members from crime, and so do for the sake of these as truly as for its own. It should not suffer human nature to fall so deeply, so terribly, if the ruin can be avoided. Society ought not to breed Monsters in its bosom. If it will not use its prosperity to save the ignorant and poor from the blackest vice, if it will even quicken vice by its selfishness and luxury, its worship of wealth, its scorn of human nature, then it must suffer, and deserves to suffer, from crime.

"I would that, as a city, we might understand and feel, how far we are chargeable with much of the crime and misery around us, of which we complain. Is it not an acknowledged moral truth, that we are answerable for all evil which we are able, but have failed, to prevent? Were Providence to put us in possession of a remedy for a man dying at our feet, and should we withhold it, would not the guilt of his death lie at our door? Are we not accessory to the destruction of the blind man, who, in our sight, approaches a precipice, and whom we do not warn of his danger? On the same ground much of the guilt and misery around us must be imputed to ourselves. Why is it that so many children in a large city grow up in ignorance and vice? Because that city abandons them to ruinous influences, from which it might and ought to rescue them. Why is beggary so often transmitted from parent to child? Because the public and because individuals do little or nothing to break the fatal inheritance. Whence come many of the darkest crimes? From despondency, recklessness, and a pressure of suffering, which sympathy would have lightened. Human sympathy, Christian sympathy, were it to penetrate the dwellings of the ignorant, poor, and suffering, were its voice lifted up to encourage, guide, and

console, and its arm stretched out to sustain, what a new world would it call into being! What a new city should we live in! How many victims of stern justice would become the living, joyful witnesses of the regenerating power of a wise Christian love."—pp. 11—14.

We would direct especial attention to this appeal to the *interested* view of the great educational question.

"But, still more, we defeat ourselves, when we neglect the moral state of the city where we live, under pretence of caring for our families. How little may it profit you, my friends, that you labour at home, if in the next street, amidst haunts of vice, the incendiary, the thief, the ruffian, is learning his lesson, or preparing his instruments of destruction? How little may it profit you, that you are striving to educate your children, if, around you, the children of others are neglected, are contaminated with evil principles or impure passions? Where is it that our sons often receive the most powerful impulses? In the street, at school, from associates. Their ruin may be sealed by a young female brought up in the haunts of vice. Their first oaths may be echoes of profaneness which they hear from the sons of the abandoned. What is the great obstruction to our efforts for educating our children? It is the corruption around us. That corruption steals into our homes, and neutralizes the influence of home. We hope to keep our little circle pure, amidst general impurity. This is like striving to keep our particular houses healthy, when infection is raging around us. If an accumulation of filth in our neighbourhood were sending forth foul stench and pestilential vapours on every side, we should not plead as a reason for letting it remain, that we were striving to prevent a like accumulation within our own doors. Disease would not less certainly invade us, because the source of it was not prepared by ourselves. The infection of moral evil is as perilous as that of the plague. We have a personal interest in the prevalence of order and good principles on every side. If any member of the social body suffer, all must suffer with it. This is God's ordination and his merciful ordination. It is thus that he summons us to watch over our brother for his good."—pp. 16, 17.

Entering upon the particular subject of the Discourse, the author adds the name of Joseph Tuckerman to the many, previously on record, who have given little promise in their youthful days of what they were eventually to become and to perform:—

"My acquaintance with Joseph Tuckerman began about forty-seven years ago, and, during most of the time which has since elapsed, we lived together as brothers, communicating thoughts, feelings, reproofs, encouragements, with a faithfulness not often surpassed. I think of him with peculiar pleasure, as he was, perhaps, the most signal example, within my remembrance, of Improvement; of a man overcoming obstacles, and making progress under disadvantages. When I first met

him in college, he had the innocence of childhood; he was sympathizing, generous, without a stain of the vices to which youth is prone; but he did not seem to have any serious views of life. Three years he passed almost as a holiday, unconscious of his privileges, uninterested in his severer studies, surrendering himself to sportive impulses, which, however harmless in themselves, consumed the hours which should have been given to toil. How often has he spoken to me, with grief and compunction, of his early wasted life! In his last college year, a change began, and the remote cause of it he often spoke of with lively sensibility. His mother, he was accustomed to say, was one of the best of women. She had instilled into him the truths of religion with a mother's love, tempered with no common wisdom. The seed was sown in a kindly nature. The religious principle, which at first had only been a restraint from evil, began to incite to good; and to this, the progress and greatness of his life were mainly due. On leaving college he gave himself to the Christian ministry; but with the unchastened inconsideration of his youth, he plunged into its duties with little preparation. The consequence was a succession of mortifications most painful at the time, but of which he afterwards spoke as a merciful discipline. So unpromising was the opening of a career of singular energy and usefulness."—pp. 27, 28.

We go on—for we know not how to do otherwise—and the picture, which the following passage gives, is one which we think no Christian can study without conscious and rich advantage. Such sunbeams are calculated, by a sort of spiritual Daguereotype, to leave images on the soul, that are worthy of the Light that imprints them:

"His strength did not lie in abstract speculation. Had he given himself to this, he would never have forced his way to new or great views. His heart was his great power. To his moral, religious, benevolent sentiments, he owed chiefly the expansion of his intellectual nature. Having laid a good foundation by study, an unerring instinct taught him that study was not his vocation. His heart yearned for active life. He became more and more penetrated with the miseries and crimes of the world. As he sat in his lonely study, the thought of what men endured on the land and the sea withdrew him from his books. He was irresistibly attracted towards his fellow-creatures by their sufferings, and, still more, by a consciousness that there was something great beneath their sufferings, by a sympathy with their spiritual wants. His study window looked on the sea; and the white sail, as it skirted the horizon, reminded him of the ignorance and moral perils of the sailor; and accordingly he was the first man in the country to make an effort for the improvement and instruction of this class of men. The society which he instituted for this end did not answer its purpose, for he knew little or nothing of the people he wished to serve, nor was the community then awake, as it now is, to the work of reform. But the spirit which was moving in him was not depressed by

failure. He soon gave himself with zeal to the missionary cause; thought, talked and wrote about it with characteristic energy; and, had not family ties prevented, would have devoted himself, I believe, to the service of the heathen.

"Whilst the passion for conflict with evil was struggling within him, his health failed, and for a time he had reason to fear that he was to be cut off from usefulness. But the same gracious Providence which had ordained, with signal kindness, the events of his past existence, was guiding him through this dark passage to the great sphere and purpose of his life. His disease incapacitated him for answering the demand made upon his voice by the pulpit. He felt that he must cease from regular preaching; and what, then, was he to do? In a favoured hour, the thought of devoting himself to the service of the poor of this city entered his mind, and met a response within which gave it the character of a divine monition. He consulted me, and in obedience to a long-rooted conviction, that society needs new ministries and agencies for its redemption, and that men, inspired with self-sacrificing zeal for its redemption, are God's best gifts to the world, I encouraged his faith and hope.

"At first, he entered almost tremblingly the houses of the poor, where he was a stranger, to offer his sympathy and friendship. But 'the sheep knew the voice of the shepherd.' The poor recognised by instinct their friend, and from the first moment a relation of singular tenderness and confidence was established between them. That part of his life I well remember, for he came often to pour into my ear and heart his experience and success. I well remember the effect which contact with the poor produced on his mind. He had loved them when he knew little of them; when their distresses came to him through the imagination. But he was a proof that no speculation or imagination can do the work of actual knowledge. So deep was the sympathy, so intense the interest which the poor excited in him, that it seemed as if a new fountain of love had been opened within him. No favourite of fortune could have repaired to a palace, where the rays of royal favour were to be centred on him, with a more eager spirit and quicker step, than our friend hastened to the abodes of want in the darkest alleys of our city. How often have I stood humbled before the deep, spiritual love, which burst from him in those free communications which few enjoyed beside myself. I cannot forget one evening, when, in conversing with the late Dr. Follen and myself on the claims of the poor, and on the cold-heartedness of society, he not only deeply moved us, but filled us with amazement by his depth of feeling and energy of utterance; nor can I forget, how, when he left us, Dr. Follen, a man fitted by his own spirit to judge of greatness, said to me, '*He is* a great man.'

"This strong love for his fellow-creatures was not a wild enthusiasm. It was founded on clear, deliberate perception of the spiritual nature, the immortal destination of every human being. Whoever discerns truly, and feels deeply, this greatness of humanity, this relation of the soul to God, must indeed pass for an enthusiast in the present day; for

our state of society is, in a great degree, a denial of the higher rights, claims and destinies of a human being.

"It was this love for the poor which gave to our friend's labours their efficacy, which made his ministry a living thing, and which gave it perpetuity. This house and our other chapels had their foundation in this love. He could not be kept from the poor. Cold, storms, sickness, severe pain, could not shut him up at home. Nothing but his domestic ties prevented him from taking up his abode among the indigent. He would sometimes say, that could he, on leaving the world, choose his sphere, it would be that of a ministering spirit to the poor; and if the spirits of departed good men return to our world, his, I doubt not, might be found in the haunts of want and woe. In this, as I have already said, there was no blinding enthusiasm. He saw distinctly the vices which are often found among the poor, their craft, and sloth, and ingratitude. His ministry was carried on in the midst of their frequent filth and recklessness. The coarsest realities pressed him on every side. These were not the scenes to make an enthusiast. But amidst these he saw, now the fainter signs, now the triumphs of a divine virtue. It was his delight to relate examples of patience, disinterestedness, piety, amidst severest sufferings. These taught him, that, in the poorest hovels, he was walking among immortals, and his faith in the divinity within the soul turned his ministry into joy."—pp. 29—33.

Lessons of first-rate usefulness to the friends of the poor are contained in the paragraphs which follow:—

"His influence over the poor was a good deal increased by the variety of forms in which he exerted it. He was not merely a spiritual guide. He had much skill in the details of common life, was a good economist, understood much about the trades and labours in which the poor are most occupied, could suggest expedients for diminishing expense and multiplying comforts, and by these homely gifts won the confidence of the poor. He could sympathise with them in their minutest wants and sufferings, and opened a way for his high truths by being a wise counsellor as to their worldly interests. At the very moment when he passed with some for an enthusiast, he was teaching household management to a poor woman, or contriving employment for her husband, or finding a place for her child.

"This reminds me of one branch of his labours in which he took special interest. He felt deeply for the children of the poor. They were in his mind habitually as he walked the streets, and when he entered the indigent dwelling. He used to stop to inquire into the residence and history of the begging child. He visited the market and the wharf, to discover the young who were wasting the day in sloth, taking their first lessons in the art of theft. He was unwearied in his efforts to place these children in schools, and multitudes owe to him their moral safety, and the education which prepared them for respectable lives. Through his means, not a few, who had escaped all domestic control, and entered on the downward path of crime, were sent to the house of reformation; and he delighted to meet or speak of those who

under this influence had been restored to innocence. To the interest which he awakened in the unprotected children of the poor, we owe chiefly the establishment of the Farm School. If any subject peculiarly occupied his thoughts and heart, it was the duty of the city to that portion of the young, who, if not adopted by society, must grow up to guilt and shame and public punishment. If his benevolence ever broke out in bitter reproach, it was in speaking of the general insensibility to the neglected child, trained up by its parents to beggary and fraud, accustomed to breathe the fumes of intemperance, and left to look on vice as its natural state. Such was his influence, that street-beggary sensibly declined among us, an effect indicating an extent of good influence, not easily apprehended.

"To show his generous modes of viewing the poor, I would state, that for a time he assembled the children one afternoon in the week to give them instruction in natural history. He took great delight in this branch of knowledge, and had stored up in his mind a large number of facts, illustrative of the wisdom and goodness of God in the creation. These he used to unfold, and was able to awaken the curiosity and fix the attention of his young hearers; of which, indeed, they furnished proof, by giving him a portion of time usually spent in play. His want of strength, which compelled him to relinquish the pulpit, obliged him to give up this mode of teaching after a short trial.

"I mention these various exertions as illustrative of the enlarged spirit which he carried into his work. His great object was to promote religion; but religion did not stand alone in his mind. He felt its connection with intellectual cultivation, with wise household management, with neatness and propriety of manners, and especially with the discharge of parental duty; and his labours may be said to have covered almost all the departments of social life. The truth is, that his heart was in his work. He did not think of it as the work of a day, or of a few years, but of life. He wanted to grow old and die in it. The world opened nothing to him in all its various callings, more honourable, more godlike. His ambition, of which he had his share, and his disinterested and religious principles, all flowed into this channel; so that he acted with undivided energy, with a whole soul. Hence he became fruitful in expedients, detected new modes of influence, wound his way to his end gently and indirectly, and contrived to turn almost every thing to account. Some indeed complained, that he dragged his poor into all companies and conversation. But we must learn to bear the infirmities of a fervent spirit, and to forgive a love which is stronger than our own, though it may happen to want the social tact, in which the indifferent and trifling are apt to make the most proficiency."—pp. 41—45.

Then follows a passage, which we could not justify ourselves for omitting, feeling, as we do, that the Evil is come to a state which demands that the Legislature should no longer look passively on, and see it working on every side, like a kind of Moral Cholera, which seizes the soul through the senses, to convulse, to blacken, and to destroy:

"On one subject Dr. Tuckerman agreed in opinion and feeling with all who visit and labour for the poor. He felt that the poverty of our city was due chiefly to Intemperance, and that this enhances infinitely the woes of a destitute condition. A poor family, into which this vice had not found its way, was a privileged place in his sight. Poverty without drunkenness hardly seemed to rank as an evil, by the side of that which drunkenness had generated. If there was one of our citizens whom he honoured as eminently the friend of the poor, it was that unwearied philanthropist, who, whilst his heart and hands are open to all the claims of misery, has selected as his peculiar care, the cause of temperance.* Dr. Tuckerman's spirit groaned under the evils of intemperance, as the ancient prophets under the burden of the woes which they were sent to denounce. The fumes of a distillery were, to his keen feelings, more noisome and deadly than the vapours of putrefaction and pestilence. He looked on a shop for vending ardent spirits as he would have looked on a pitfall opening into hell. At the sight of men, who, under all our present lights, are growing rich by spreading these poisons through the land, he felt, I doubt not, how the curses of the lost and the groans of ruined wives and children were rising up against them. I know, for I have heard, the vehemence of entreaty with which Dr. Tuckerman sometimes approached the intemperate, and he has often related to me his persevering efforts for their recovery. Could he have bequeathed to the sober and Christian part of this city and Commonwealth his intense convictions in regard to this vice, it would soon be repressed; the sanction of public authority would no longer be given to its detestable haunts; one chief source of the miseries of our civilization would be dried up."—pp. 45, 46.

We have all smiled, but not in ridicule, at the Vicar of Wakefield's expedient to keep his wife faithful to her duty, by hanging her intended epitaph over the chimney-piece. The Christian minister, who would mould the partner of his life to a "tender and true" sympathy with his aims and cares, would do well to give a similar place to the following exquisite character, that it may daily meet the eye, and daily work upon the heart:

"Among the propitious circumstances of the life of Dr. Tuckerman, I ought not to pass over his domestic ties. He was twice married, and each of these connections gave him an invaluable friend. I was particularly acquainted with his last wife, with whom a large part of his life was spent, and am happy to pay this tribute to her singular worth. Her reserve and shrinking delicacy threw a veil over her beautiful character. She was little known beyond her home: but there she silently spread around her that soft, pure light, the preciousness of which is never fully understood till it is quenched. The good Providence which adapts blessings to our wants, was particularly manifested in giving to our friend such a companion. Her calm, gentle wisdom, her sweet humility, her sympathy, which, though tender, was too serene

* Moses Grant.

to disturb her clear perceptions, fitted her to act instinctively, and without the consciousness of either party, on his more sanguine, ardent mind. She was truly a spirit of good, diffusing a tranquillizing influence too mildly to be thought of, and therefore more sure. The blow which took her from him, left a wound which time could not heal."—p. 49.

Who can wonder at what follows?

"Had his strength been continued, so that he could have gone from the house of mourning to the haunts of poverty, he would have escaped, for a good part of the day, the sense of his bereavement. But a few minutes' walk in the street now sent him wearied home. There, the loving eye which had so long brightened at his entrance, was to shed its mild beam on him no more. There the voice that had daily inquired into his labours, and like another conscience had whispered a sweet approval, was still. There the sympathy, which had pressed with tender hand his aching head, and by its nursing care had postponed the hour of exhaustion and disease, was gone. He was not indeed left alone; for filial love and reverence spared no soothing offices; but these, though felt and spoken of as most precious, could not take the place of what had been removed. This great loss produced no burst of grief. It was a still deep sorrow, the feeling of a mighty void, the last burden which the spirit can cast off. His attachment to life from this moment sensibly declined. In seasons of particular sensibility he wished to be gone. He kept near him the likeness of his departed friend, and spoke to me more than once of the solace which he had found in it, as what I in my more favoured lot could not comprehend. He heard her voice from another world, and his anticipations of that world, always strong, became now more vivid and touching."—pp. 49, 50.

We give the remainder of the Discourse entire, for we should be sorry to omit one word of it.

"His religion was of the most enlarged, liberal character. He did not shut himself up even in Christianity. He took a lively interest in the testimony borne to God by nature, and in the strivings of ancient philosophy after divine truth. But Christianity was his rock, his defence, his nutriment, his life. He understood the character of Jesus by sympathy, as well as felt the need of his 'glad tidings.' He had been a faithful student of the Old Testament, and had once thought of preparing a work on Jewish antiquities. But his growing reverence for the New Testament led him to place a vast distance between it and the ancient scriptures. At one period of his ministry, when the pressing demands of the poor compelled him to forego study entirely, I recollect his holding up to me a Greek Harmony of the Four Gospels, and his saying, that here was his library, that Christ's history was his theology, and that in the morning he snatched a moment for this, when he could find time for nothing else.

"Religion in different individuals, manifests itself in different forms.

In him it shone forth peculiarly in faith or filial trust, and in gratitude. His faith in God was unbounded. It never wavered, never seemed to undergo a momentary eclipse. I have seen him under an affliction, which in a few days wrought in his appearance the change of years; and his trust was like a rock, his submission entire. Much as he saw of the crimes and miseries of life, no doubt of the merciful purposes of God crossed his mind. Some ray of divine goodness streamed forth from the darkest trials and events. Undoubtedly his own love for the poor helped him to comprehend, as few do, how God loved them. The whole creation spoke to him of the paternal character and infinite glory of its author. His filial piety called forth in him powers which would otherwise have slumbered. He was naturally wanting in the poetical element. He had little relish for music or the fine arts, and took no great pleasure in the higher works of imagination. But his piety opened his eye, ear, heart, to the manifestations of God in his works, revealed the beauty which surrounded him, and in this way became a source of sublime joy. On such a mind, religious controversies could take but a slight hold. He outgrew them, and hardly seemed to know that they existed. That which pervades, tranquillizes and exalts the souls of all Christians he understood; and in his busy life, which carried him from his study, he was willing to understand nothing more.

"Congenial with this cheerful faith was the spirit of gratitude. In this he was probably the more eminent, because it was favoured by his temperament. He was naturally happy. There were next to no seeds of gloom, depression in his nature. Life, as he first knew it, was bright, joyous, unclouded; and to this cause mainly the volatility of his early years was to be ascribed. As the magnet searches out, and gathers round itself the scattered ore with which it has affinity, so his spirit selected and attached instinctively to itself the more cheerful views of Providence. In such a nature, piety naturally took the form of gratitude. Thanks were the common breathings of his spirit. His lot seemed to him among the most favoured on earth. His blessings did not wait to be recalled to his thoughts by a set, laboured search. They started up of themselves, and stood before him robed in celestial light by association with the goodness which bestowed them.

"From these elements of his piety, naturally grew up a hope of future glory, progress, happiness, more unmixed than I have known in others. The other world is commonly said to throw a brightness over the present. In his case, the present also threw a brightness over the future. His constant experience of God's goodness awakened anticipations of a larger goodness hereafter. He would talk with a swelling heart, and in the most genuine language, of immortality, of Heaven, of new access to God. In truth his language was such as many good men could not always join in. The conscious unworthiness of many good men throws occasional clouds over the future. But no cloud seemed ever to dim his prospect; not that he was unconscious of unworthiness; not that he thought of approaching Infinite Purity with a claim of merit; such a feeling never crossed his mind. But it was so natural to him to enjoy, his sense of God's constant goodness was so vivid, and Christ's

promises so accordant with his experience, that heaven came to him as a reality, without the ordinary effort which the faith and hope of most men require.

"In his last sickness, his character came out in all its beauty. He had not wholly lost the natural love of life. At times, when unpromising symptoms seemed to be giving way, he would use the means of recovery with hope. But generally he felt himself a dying man, whose chief work was finished, who had little to do with the world but to leave it. I have regretted that I did not take notes of some of his conversations. It was unsafe for him to talk, as the least excitement increased his burning fever; but when I would start an interesting topic, a flood of thoughts would rush into his mind, and compel him to give them utterance. The future state was of course often present to him; and his conceptions of the soul's life and progress, in its new and nearer relations to God, to Christ, to the just made perfect, seemed to transport him for a time beyond the darkness and pains of his present lot. To show that there was no morbidness in these views, I ought to observe, that they were mingled with the natural tastes and feelings which had grown from his past life. In his short seasons of respite from exhaustion and suffering, he would talk with interest of the more important events of the day, and would seek recreation in books which had formerly entertained him. He was the same man as in health, with nothing forced or unnatural in his elevation of mind. He had always taken great pleasure in the writings of the moralists of antiquity, and perhaps the last book I put into his hands was Cicero's Tusculan Questions, which he read with avidity and delight. So comprehensive was his spirit, that whilst Christ was his hope, and Christian perfection his aspiration, he still rejoiced to discern in the great Roman, on whom Christian truth had not yet dawned, such deep reverence for the majesty of virtue. It might be expected that "his ruling passion was strong in death." To the last moment of my intercourse with him, the poor were in his heart. As he had given them his life, so death could not divide him from them.

"One affecting view remains to be given. Dr. Tuckerman was a martyr to his cause. That his life was shortened by excessive toil cannot be doubted. His friends forewarned him of this result. He saw the danger himself, and once and again resolved to diminish his labours; but when he retreated from the poor, they followed him to his house, and he could not resist their supplicating looks and tones. To my earnest and frequent remonstrance on this point he at times replied, that his ministry might need a victim, that labours beyond his strength might be required to show what it was capable of effecting, and that he was willing to suffer and to die for the cause. Living thus he grew prematurely old. His walks became more and more narrow. Then he was imprisoned at home. The prostration of strength was followed by a racking cough and burning fever. As we have seen, his last sickness was a bright testimony to his piety: but its end was sorrowful. By a mysterious ordination of Providence, the capacity of suffering often survives unimpaired, whilst the reason and affections seem to decay. So

was it here. In the last hours of our friend, the body seemed to prevail over the power of thought. He died in fearful pain. He was borne amidst agonies into the higher world. At length his martyrdom ceased; and who of us can utter or conceive the blessedness of the spirit, rising from this thick darkness into the light of Heaven?

"Such was the founder of the Ministry at Large in this city, a man whom I thoroughly knew; a man whose imperfections I could not but know, for they stood out on the surface of his character; but who had a great heart, who was willingly a victim to the cause which in the love and fear of God he had espoused, and who has left behind him as a memorial, not this fleeting tribute of friendship, but an institution which is to live for ages, and which entitles him to be ranked among the benefactors of this city and the world. When he began his work, he had no anticipation of such an influence and such an honour. He thought that he was devoting himself to an obscure life. He did not expect that his name would be heard beyond the dwellings of the poor. He was contented with believing, that here and there an individual or a family would receive strength, light and consolation from his ministry. But gradually the idea that he was beginning a movement, that might survive him, and might more and more repress the worst social evils, opened on his mind. He saw more and more clearly, that the Ministry at Large, with other agencies, was to change the aspect of a large portion of society. It became his deliberate conviction, and one which he often repeated, that great cities need not be haunts of vice and poverty; that in this city, there were now intelligence, virtue and piety enough, could they be brought into united action, to give a new intellectual and moral life to the more neglected classes of society. In this faith he acted, toiled, suffered and died. His gratitude to God for sending him into this field of labour never failed him. For weeks before he left the country, never to return, I was almost the only visitor whom he had strength to see; and it was a joy to look on his pale, emaciated face, lighted up with thankfulness for the work which had been given him to do, and with the hope that it would endure and grow when he should sleep in the dust. From such a life and such a death, let us learn to love our poor and suffering brethren; and, as we have ability, let us send to them faithful and living men, whose sympathy, councils, prayers, will assuage sorrow, awaken the conscience, touch the heart, guide the young, comfort the old, and shed over the dark paths of this life the brightness of the life to come."—pp. 52—60.

A paragraph, given as an Appendix, should have been inserted in the text. It speaks of the attachment of Dr. Tuckerman to individual friends—making, among others, a passing reference to his endearing and valued intercourse with Lady Byron, whose sympathy with the wretched is only equalled by her love for the good. The remainder of the Appendix is occupied by two papers—the first, a letter from the distinguished Judge Story, containing a summary of his reminiscences of Dr. Tuckerman; the second, a Biographical Sketch by the Rev.

E. S. Gannett, taken from the Monthly Miscellany, for July 1840. Both are valuable documents, and throw light upon the text;—but it must not be lost sight of, that the Discourse altogether is not a Biographical but an Ethical work. It is not a Life of Dr. Tuckerman, but a portraiture of his mind. The field is still open to those who may be able, or who may desire, to let us more into the private history of one so widely honoured and beloved. Too much can hardly be known of a fellow-being, from whose life and labours death has partially lifted the veil, and given us glimpses of a Cloud passing fast into Glory.

J. J.

---

## SONNET.

" Tears should not
Be shed upon an infant's face,
It is unlucky."

WORDSWORTH.

RESTRAIN thy grief, sad heart, thy tears assuage
Which stain this Baby's brow; it is not meet
That they should touch it with their burning feet,
And tell him now of his sure heritage.
For they may bring the evil they presage,—
A lengthened life, made sad by friends' deceit;
By actual want; Love cherished but to cheat;
By hope deferred, and lone neglected age.
Or, if they bear no evil augury,
Let them escape not from their fountains deep;
It is not well he look on sorrow's strife
Before he knoweth wherefore mortals weep,—
Nor upon pain, not feeling sympathy,
Lest he with stoic heart, hereafter look on life.

## Art. VIII.—SCRAPS FROM THE GERMAN.

### I. The Blossom.—*A Parable from the German of Krummacher.*

"How can the Possessor of all things require my thanks?" said Othniel, to his tutor Simeon.

"Not He," answered the sage, "but Thou."

"I! want my own thanks, which I offer to the Most High! what a paradox!" exclaimed the youth.

But the greyhead answered, "Has not the Creator commanded plants to blossom, before they bring forth fruit?"

"It is the completion of the plant," replied Othniel.

"Gratitude," said Simeon, "is the blossom of the heart!"

### II. David's Harp.—*From Krummacher.*

One day, David, the king of Israel, sat on the heights of Zion; his harp stood beside him, and he leaned his head against it.

And the prophet Gad went up to him, and said, "What meditatest thou upon, O King?"

And David answered and said, "On my ever-varying lot. How many songs of Praise and Joy have I sung to this harp; yet how many also of Mourning and Lamentation!"

"Be thou like unto thy harp!" said the Prophet.

"How?" enquired the King.

"Behold," answered the man of God,—"Thy grief brought forth heavenly sounds from out thy harp, and inspired its strings, even as did thy joy. Let thy heart and thy life be attuned both by grief and joy into a heavenly harp!"

And David arose, and grasped the strings.

### III. The Day of Rest.—*From Krummacher.*

"Wherefore," said Samma the youth, to his preceptor, "does the Eternal require the service of Man? Wherefore the celebration of the Sabbath day? It was ordained for the discipline of barbarous ages. Is not one day like unto another? Does not the light of the sun shine equally on all?"

But the rabbi answered and said—" When the children of Israel were returning from their captivity into the Promised Land, there lived, with his wife and family, on the borders of Mesopotamia, an Israelite of the name of Boni, a Levite and wise man. And the angel of the Lord appeared to him in the form of a messenger from the King Arthasasta, and said—'Arise, thou, and thy wife, and thy children, and thy men-servants, and thy maidens, and go into the land of thy fathers, that thou mayest counsel thy people, and aid in ordering aright the city and the land.'

" Then Boni answered and said—'The king my master will graciously receive the thanks of his servant; but how shall I traverse the desert with my wife and children, seeing I know not the way?'

" But the messenger said, 'Arise, and make thee ready, and learn to trust thy Sovereign!'

" Then Boni arose, and journeyed, as the angel of the Lord had commanded him, with his wife and his children, at dawn of day. But Boni doubted, and said in his heart, 'How shall it be with us?'

" And they journeyed through the desert until even. And when they had gone six parasangs, and were very weary, behold! there stood by the wayside a tent; and a man came out of it, and said to Boni and his people, 'Here rest ye!'

" And they rested, and refreshed their souls. And Boni said, 'It is the king's goodness that allows us to rest and refresh ourselves here, but who shall conduct us farther on our way?'

" Then the man came, and showed Boni both the right and the wrong way, and drew for him the road on a sheet for six parasangs farther, and said, 'Now depart in peace.'

" And Boni travelled onward with his companions on the road that had been pointed out to him; and they bore with patience the fatigues of the way, for they thought of the refreshments that they had received.

" And when they had left six parasangs more behind them, another tent arose by the wayside. And here too they found another servant of the king's, who comforted them, and showed them again the right way and the wrong, that they might choose. And so it continued for eighty days' journey; and when they had accomplished them, they found themselves in the Land of Promise. Then Boni perceived that the Angel of the Lord had guided him: and he took care, with Ezra and Nehemiah, that the Sabbath was kept holy, for the people had grown reckless and wild.

"Seest thou, Samma," continued the preceptor, "the Life of man is as this pilgrimage: the six parasangs are six days; but the seventh is a day of rest; and the tent of the Lord stands open to man, that he may enter in, and reflect on his ways, and trust in the Lord. The Reckless cares not for the tent, and his track loses itself in the desert: but the Wise finds refreshment, and reaches at last the Promised Land!"

## IV.—*From Körner's* "Hedwig."

*Hedwig, sitting at her work-frame; the Countess, standing at an open window.* [*Lights burning.*]

*Countess.*—How clear this summer evening, and how calm!
The moonbeams resting like a golden dream
O'er slumb'ring nature; zephyrs, soft and low,
Whisper among the limes; and through the dim
And misty wood, the moon's reflected light
Shines palely from the glacier. Such an hour
Wakes in my soul a thousand images,
That life's rough hand had long ago obscur'd.
My youthful heart's first brilliant dream returns,
And mem'ry calls her long array of joys
Clearly before me.
*Hedwig.*— Calls she her *joys* alone?
*Countess.*—Only her joys;—her griefs remain unwak'd,
An earthborn race, that shall be mortal only.—
But Joy rewakes, the gentle child of Heaven,
Eternal still, as Thought; and ev'ry morn
Brings back her train. The wind's tempestuous force
Clears off the fog, and the quick-forming clouds
That send their flashing ruin on us, break
Before the sun's mild rays.—So wintry storms
Pass trackless o'er the starry firmament,
And Evening shows unchang'd the brilliant train
That, silent, girdle round this lower world.

S. F.

# INTELLIGENCE.

## NON-PAROCHIAL REGISTERS.

A COPY of the following letter has been received by the Dissenting Ministers who had entrusted their Chapel Registers to the Registration Commission:—

General Register Office,
*August 11th*, 1841.

Sir,

I am directed by the Registrar-General to inform you that the Commission for enquiring into the state, custody and authenticity of Non-Parochial Registers and Records has ceased, and that the Registers and Records examined and certified by the Commissioners have, pursuant to the Act of 3 & 4 Victoria, cap. 92, been deposited in the custody of the Registrar-General, and are at present at the Office in the Rolls Yard, Chancery Lane, London, which, for the purposes of the aforesaid Act, is deemed a branch or part of the General Register Office. Searches and extracts from these Registers and Records will be granted on every day *except Sundays, Christmas-day, and Good-Friday*, between the hours of 10 and 4, *upon personal application only, and payment of the legal fees*, and in accordance with the regulations made by the Registrar-General, with the approbation of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State. Applications by letter for search or extract cannot be complied with. All other communications by letter on the subject of the above-mentioned Registers and Records must be addressed to "The Registrar-General, General Register Office, London;" and it is requested that the words "Non-Parochial Registers" may be written on the outside of all such letters, the postage of which may be left unpaid.*

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,
Thomas Mann, *Chief Clerk*.

---

* By the Act of 3 & 4 Victoria, cap. 92, sec. 5, it is enacted, "That the Registrar-General shall cause Lists to be made of all the Registers and Records which may be placed in his custody by virtue of this Act; and every person shall be entitled, on payment of the Fees hereinafter mentioned, to search the said Lists, and any Register or Record therein mentioned, between the hours of Ten in the Morning, and Four in the Afternoon of every day, except *Sundays* and *Christmas Day* and *Good Friday*, but subject to such regulations as may be made from time to time by the Registrar-General, with the approbation of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, and to have a certified extract of any entry in the said Registers or Records, and for every search in any such Register or Record shall be paid the sum of One Shilling: and for every such certified extract the sum of Two Shillings and Sixpence, and no more."

By sec. 8 of the same Act, it is enacted, "That every person who shall wilfully destroy or injure, or cause to be destroyed or injured, any Register or Record of Birth or Baptism, Naming or Dedication, Death or Burial, or Marriage, which shall

In the year 1836, a parliamentary commission was appointed to enquire into the state, condition, and custody of all registers (not being parochial) of births, deaths, and marriages, with the view of ascertaining how far it might be practicable to give to such documents a legal character, and place them, in a civil point of view, on the same footing as the registers of parish churches and those of the general registry.

The registration commissioners, in pursuance of the object for which they were appointed, issued a circular dated 2nd Dec. 1836, addressed to the ministers, trustees, &c., of all the Protestant non-conformist churches in England and Wales, soliciting all persons who had the custody of such registers to transmit them to the office of the commissioners for examination, with the ulterior view, in case they should be found sufficiently accurate, of their being legalized by the act contemplated by the government, and placed in safe custody in a public office.

In compliance with this circular, a large number of registers from various denominations of dissenters were forwarded to the commissioners, but many congregations have stated their reluctance absolutely to surrender their registers, or indeed to forward documents of such importance for inspection, without a further guarantee as to their safe preservation, and a distinct and easy mode of obtaining access to them while in custody of the commissioners: a second circular, dated 12th April 1837, was issued by these authorities, intimating that "if the registers are withholden, the objects of the commission will be defeated, and your congregation will deprive themselves and their successors of the benefit of any provision respecting these registers, which, in pursuance of the recommendation of the commissioners, the legislature may hereafter be disposed to adopt."

---

be deposited with the Registrar-General by virtue of this Act, or any part thereof, or shall falsely make or counterfeit, or cause to be falsely made or counterfeited, any part of such Register or Record, or shall wilfully insert or cause to be inserted in any of such Registers or Records any false entry of any Birth or Baptism, Naming or Dedication, Death or Burial, or Marriage, or who shall wilfully give any false certificate, or shall certify any writing to be an extract from any Register or Record, knowing the same Register or Record to be false in any part thereof, or shall forge or counterfeit the Seal of the said Office, shall be guilty of Felony."

By sec. 9 of the same Act, it is enacted, "That the Registrar-General shall certify all extracts which may be granted by him from the Registers or Records deposited, or to be deposited, in the said Office, and made receivable in evidence by virtue of the provisions herein contained, by causing them to be sealed or stamped with the Seal of the Office; and all extracts purporting to be stamped with the Seal of the said Office shall be received in evidence in all civil cases; instead of the production of the original Registers or Records containing such entries, subject nevertheless to the provisions hereinafter contained."

By sec. 10 of the same Act, it is enacted, "That every extract granted by the Registrar-General from any of the said Registers or Records shall describe the Register or Record from which it is taken, and shall express that it is one of the Registers or Records deposited in the General Register Office under this Act; and the production of any of the said Registers or Records from the General Register Office, in the custody of the proper officer thereof, or the production of any such certified extract containing such description as aforesaid, and purporting to be stamped with the Seal of the said Office, shall be sufficient to prove that such Register or Record is one of the Registers or Records deposited in the General Register Office under this Act, in all cases in which the Register or Record, or any certified extract therefrom, is herein respectively declared admissible in evidence."

This circular further declared, that one "result of the commissioners' labours was *to make the registers accessible*," a result which could not be secured except upon the principle of their being deposited with a public officer, "*from whom extracts and certificates might be easily procured.*" "So long," continues the circular, "as the books remain under the custody of the commissioners, applications for extracts may be sent by post, and such extracts shall be furnished, free of postage or other charge, with the signature of the secretary of the commission, vouching for their correctness."

In consequence of this communication we believe nearly every non-parochial register in England and Wales was transmitted to the commissioners, to whom it is but justice to say that they faithfully performed their duties, honestly redeemed their pledges, and in every way consulted the convenience and met the wishes of ministers and congregations in the prompt transmission of extracts while the registers remained in their custody.

By act 3 and 4 Vic., cap. 92, all the registers which had been approved by the commissioners, received the sanction of law, were placed under the charge of the registrar-general, and became in every important respect, of equal value and importance with parochial and general registers.

By the 5th sec. of that act, the legal fees were fixed at one shilling for a search, and two shillings and sixpence for an extract, the mode of procuring or furnishing these to be determined from time to time by regulations made by the registrar-general, with the sanction of one of her Majesty's principal secretaries of state.

How far these regulations, as hitherto framed, are calculated to carry out the spirit of the act, and fulfil the expectation raised by the circulars of the commissioners, may be judged of by the following extract from an order issued by the registrar-general immediately on obtaining the custody of these important records:—"Searches and extracts will be granted, upon *personal* application ONLY, at the office, Rolls-yard, Chancery-lane, London. Applications, by letter, for search, or extract, *cannot be complied with.*"

It is scarcely possible to conceive how the registrar-general could have framed a regulation so unjust and vexatious, unless in total ignorance of the nature of the objects contemplated by the act, and the circumstances of the persons to whom access to these documents is in the great majority of cases of importance.

Such a regulation is *unjust* and invidious; the registers of all parochial churches being accessible to the public in every separate parish, on the payment of a small fee: and the general registers, *under the new act*, being also accessible in every district, copies only being deposited in the London office. The regulation is *vexatious*; acting indeed as an absolute prohibition to the persons to whom extracts are frequently of the greatest value; the majority of such applications being from those in the humblest ranks, requiring vouchers for the age of their children, as a necessary step to procuring them admission into the factory or charity school; soldiers and sailors soliciting pensions; or emigrants seekings a free passage to the colonies.

It is earnestly to be desired, that representations embodying these facts should be made to the registrar-general, from as many quarters as possible, and with the least practicable delay. It is hardly possible that such representations will fail to procure the recal of an order so generally obnoxious, and which has all the force and odium of a penalty for religious opinion—a penalty too which may be incurred by a conscientious member of the establishment should he unhappily have had a parent who preferred the baptism of the Dissenting chapel to the same ceremony in the parish church.

The following memorial, drawn up, we believe, by the Rev. William Smith, (of Stockport,) has been submitted to the members of the denomination with which he is connected. A document to the same effect should speedily be prepared by all other denominations similarly aggrieved.

*To the Registrar-General.*

*The Memorial of the undersigned Dissenting Ministers,*

Sheweth,—That your memorialists transmitted the registers of births and deaths, belonging to their respective congregations, to the commissioners appointed to inquire into the state of registers not being parochial, with the precise understanding, as expressed in the circular of the commissioners, that the objects to be attained by the labours of the commission were, "to secure the safe preservation of these records, *to make them accessible*, and to impart to them the character of legal evidence."

That your memorialists are grateful for the measure, which has lately passed the legislature, giving to these records the character of legal documents, and placing them for safe custody in the charge of the registrar-general.

That your memorialists conceive that the utility of this measure will be seriously lessened by the enforcement of the regulation which has lately been made by your authority, and which requires that a *personal* application shall in every case be made either for a search or extract.

Your memorialists beg respectfully to state, that, as ministers of congregations to whom the custody of these registers was formally committed, they know it to be a fact, that the great majority of applications for searches and extracts are from persons who do not possess the means of making personal application either by themselves or deputy at a London office, and to whom this regulation will be a most serious grievance.

That your memorialists regard this regulation as not only vexatious but unjust, all other registers, whether parochial or general, being locally accessible. Your memorialists, therefore, respectfully request that you will re-consider the regulation, and permit the officer in whose custody the registers may be placed, to furnish extracts from them, by letters, to those persons who may make *written* application, enclosing at the same time the legal fees.

Stockport, 6th September, 1841.

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We must decline noticing or inserting Criticisms on Articles that have appeared in this Periodical; and, indeed, we know not on what principle any one can ask us to give circulation to views and opinions which are not our own. If we did so, we should, of course, have to review our Reviewers,—and this would lead to rejoinders, and the matter would be endless. We disown the meaning which an unknown Correspondent finds in a passage of a late Article on Miracles,—and consequently with him we have no controversy. The writer of that Article entertains, and expresses in the Article itself, the highest value for the precepts of Christ, unrivalled and perfect, as they are; yet he ventures to think that they do not constitute the *peculiar* part of Christianity,—and that they do not constitute the sources of its peculiar *power*, indispensable, as they undoubtedly are, to the full understanding of that which *is* peculiar in Christianity. "*I* am the way, and the truth, and the life," said the Christ. There *was* an ethical Christianity long prevalent amongst us, which seemed to forget that Jesus alone is the full expression of his own Religion,—or capable of communicating to other hearts his own spirit of Love and Power.

RICHARD KINDER, PRINTER, GREEN ARBOUR COURT, OLD BAILEY.

GTU Library
3 2400 00270 0270